UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. IV JANUARY-MARCH, 1952 No. 1

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.
The Coming Assembly of Lund

MARTIN JUGIE, A.A.
The Roman Primacy at the Council of Chalcedonia

EDWARD F. HANAHOE, S.A.
Cardinal Newman and Corporate Reunion

JOSEPH GILL, S.J.
The Anglican Communion and Some Current Schemes of Union

N. G. M. VAN DOORNIK
Reformatio Reformata,
A Trend in the Dutch Reformed Church

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS
Dr. Asmussen Views Catholic-Lutheran Relations
Current Unionistic Thought in the Unity Octave

NEWS
Ecumenism and Reunion — Around the World

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, N.Y.

Imprimatur:

✠ Aloysius Traglia

Archiepus Caesarien Vicegerens

May 22, 1951

The Coming Assembly of Lund

Liturgical Problems

THE "World Council of Churches," founded at Amsterdam in 1948, forms a bond of union among a great number of Christian denominations. It is a union that permits a certain internal autonomy, or at least a certain individuality for the two movements which brought it into being, namely, the *Life and Work* movement, practical rather than doctrinal, stemming from Soderblom, and the *Faith and Order* movement which, following more closely the lines marked out by Charles Brent, is more concerned with doctrine. It is the *Faith and Order* Commission under the chairmanship of the Lutheran Bishop of Upsala, Brilioth, son-in-law of Soderblom, which is now organizing a great assembly at Lund for 1952. This assembly promises to surpass the Amsterdam Assembly in real importance. In this matter of welding together the union of Christians that has been left shattered for centuries, many means may be tried, but the most efficacious, and certainly the most necessary, consists in the search for doctrinal agreement.

The Lund conference has been carefully prepared. Various publications testify to the activity of the directing minds who have made a laudable attempt to clarify problems and facilitate solutions so that the coming assembly will be in a position to accomplish what is expected of it. Here I should like to express the interest I have found in a booklet entitled *Ways of Worship,* and bearing the sub-title: *A Report of a Theological Commission of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches in preparation for the Third World Conference on Faith and Order to be held at Lund, Sweden, in* 1952.

Different Forms of Worship

The booklet deals with liturgy, that is, with the manner of performing public worship. The purpose of the Commission is to give an idea of the existing forms of worship, and thereupon to suggest resolutions with a view to promoting unity.

Forms of worship may be reduced to five. Worship is either liturgical or free, and hence there are two quite distinct forms; the three others derive from the fact that the center of worship is placed either in the Eucharist, in preaching, or in awaiting the movement of the Spirit.

The members of the Commission have clearly discerned that differences in forms of worship proceed from differences in doctrine. That which seems to be common to a great many denominations at the present time is an attraction for the liturgical movement; a need is felt for communal prayer. A proper effect is expected of public worship; it follows quite naturally that greater emphasis is placed upon the sacramental elements it might contain.

To realize a liturgical renewal, some would like to reinstate usages established at the beginning of the Reformation; others would go back to the practices of the primitive church. There are those, however, who do not accept any fixed rule. As partisans of free forms, they depend upon no other aid than the movement of the Holy Ghost.

The Questions

According to the spokesmen of the Commission, the questions to be discussed in considering the liturgy from an ecumenical point of view, that

is, with reference to Christian reunion, fall under six heads. We shall pass them in review.

First, the principles are examined. Is liturgy itself a matter of tradition, or should it be accepted as the expression of actual and spontaneous sentiment? The Commission favors tradition, but not with a narrow or exclusive attitude. But does tradition speak in favor of the cult of Mary? On this point one receives the impression that the Virgin is a source of discord among non-Roman Christians. The prejudiced notion that the cult of Mary is tantamount to the adoration of a mere creature is still in vigor among many of them. The authors of the report speak of respect due to the Mother of God, but maintain at the same time an extremely reserved attitude on this point and would seem to exclude prayers addressed to Mary. I cannot help but wonder if it does not happen at times that an Englishman will go to the Queen Mother to obtain a favor from the King. Even the most fervent Roman Catholic devotees of Mary have always refrained from any will to adore Mary. After all, is it licit to pass judgment upon a form of worship without first taking into account the intention of those who practice it?

The second question bears upon the corporate character of worship. It is gaining a much better understanding among Christians, the report would have it. It is not opposed to a certain liberty. Recognition is made of the fact that in the Catholic Church many free forms of worship exist alongside the official cult with its precise rules. However, corporate worship is not to be had without certain distinction between the priesthood of all the faithful, as proclaimed by St. Peter, and the priesthood proper to ministers of the cult. The authors insist upon the role of the laity, and they declare that "what is lacking in the grocer is something of the priest, and what is lacking in the priest is something of the grocer" (p. 12.) They arrive none the less at the conclusion that there would be great advantage for all in doing, as many Protestant communities are now doing, withdrawing their Bishops, pastors, elders, and deacons from the preoccupations of profane duties. Whatever the case, even these more hierarchical communities fail to satisfy the aspirations of some among them who, feeling the call to a life totally consecrated to the Kingdom of God, have sought recourse in monachism. The Anglicans have already had their religious communities for a long time, and now the Calvinists of Cluny (Taizé) and Iona, and the Lutherans of the Berneuchen fellowship have now adopted monastic discipline.

The third question is closely allied to the liturgical life. Must prayer formularies be accepted, or should spontaneous prayer alone be recognized?

The report demonstrates with ease that in gatherings for public worship, all prayer should be prepared beforehand in some way, and that there would be no point in rejecting the use of formularies. In fine, services must be of three kinds: services with a determined liturgy, services in which prayers are selected for the particular occasion, and services in which the prayers are extemporaneous, or are composed for the particular service. Experience would seem to give the advantage to liturgical services in the proper sense, but nothing hinders the addition of free devotional practices as is the custom in the Roman Church.

We now come to the fourth and fifth questions, and these are the most serious, because they bear upon the Eucharist, and it is all too well known that this sacrament of unity is the cause of deep divisions among the very members of the Ecumenical Council. (1)

1) Cf. *Unitas*, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 8.

The communities which have taken part in the liturgical movement must necessarily recognize the importance of the eucharistic service. As the Lutheran Bishop Stahlin has written, "The Real Presence of Christ is the foundation of all liturgy." But does this trend mean that in the order of the economy of salvation they will place the emphasis on sacramental efficacity rather than on preaching, contrary to the Protestant position? The authors of the report are of the opinion that in this regard there is nothing that cannot be reconciled. On the one hand, the ministry of the Word does not acquire its value from the fact that the preacher communicates his own thoughts, but from the fact that divine grace accompanies it and thus transforms it into a sort of sacrament. On the other hand, it is not just to speak of magic with reference to the sacraments. The Creator certainly has the power to make use of matter in the production of a spiritual effect, for ultimately it is His action that is efficacious and that renews hearts. Preaching, it must be acknowledged, brings with it elements of disunion of which many are not fully aware; like the Eucharist, it is enmeshed in the difficulties of intercommunion. The authors express their conviction that the opposition between the Eucharist and the Word is not biblical (p.17.)

A still more burning question is that of sacrifice. There are members of the Ecumenical Council who consider the Eucharist as a sacrifice, while many Protestants oppose this concept with all their might. Is not this what the Reformed Protestants reject, the idea that the Mass is a repetition of Christ's Sacrifice, which St. Paul says was offered only once? Yet if instead of a repetition, one follows the thought of Dom Cassel and sees in the Mass a representation of the Sacrifice on the Cross, and an offering of the whole Mystical Body in union with the heavenly offering of Jesus, could we not find hope of an understanding, and could we not be justified in supposing that a step had been made in the direction of the Roman Church?

We would certainly say that rapprochement with the Roman Church's doctrine would hardly be advanced if the Mass were to be reduced to a simple act of thanksgiving for the death of Christ on Calvary, or a mere foretaste of the eternal banquet. In any case, the effort of comprehension that is made in this report is a matter of no little satisfaction.

The last question examined by the Committee is that of Baptism. At the present time it is the cause of grave divisions among the non-Catholic communities. Some denominations, and with them Karl Barth, reject the baptism of infants and admit only baptism by immersion. The authors of the report leave no doubt that they take the side of infant baptism, and hold that immersion is not necessary.

Conclusions

We now arrive at the conclusions of the Commission. What is the task that the Lund Conference intends to accomplish? When the delegates find themselves faced by the differences that exist in the worship of the various communities, they should take pains to distinguish on the one hand those that arise from irreconcilable doctrines, and consequently stand as obstacles to unity, and on the other hand, those that depend upon circumstances of place, race, or custom, and which may be permitted within the same church. These do not constitute obstacles to union. It is the mind of the authors that differences arising from opposing doctrines should not give cause to lose hope in unity. A comparative study of the doctrines remains to be made with a view to ascertaining whether a rapprochement or even a change would not

be possible. The report itself should, of course, keep within the limits of questions on worship, and leave the examination of doctrinal questions to other commissions.

If I might express my own sentiments, it is my opinion that the Commission charged with the examination of liturgical questions has produced positive results. It has not only collected, classified and ordered a great amount of significant material on an extremely complex problem, but it has also stated, with a loyal regard for truth and charity, a certain number of reasonable suggestions that could do real service for the cause of unity. In fine, without exceeding the role of informants and collaborators assigned to them, the authors clearly manifest their preference for the notion of sacraments, a special priesthood, the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, for admitting a eucharistic sacrifice, the baptism of infants, and a fixed liturgy. Should they succeed in drawing the Lund Assembly along this path, they will not only have labored for a greater unity among the members of the Ecumenical Council, but they will also have brought many non-Catholics nearer to the positions of the Roman Church. CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

The Roman Primacy at the Council of Chalcedonia

RECENTLY the Pope honoured the 15th centenary of the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedonia with an encyclical which well merits the careful consideration of all those who are working for the unification of Christendom. A review of what occurred 15 centuries ago in the Asiatic suburb of Constantinople—Chalcedonia, as it was then called, Kadi-Ken to-day—should be enough in itself to do away with the obstacle blocking the way of that unity, at least as far as the Oriental Churches are concerned. We need no description of this well known obstacle. It has to do with the primacy of authority and the doctrinal infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, successor of the Apostle Peter.

Is it or is it not a fact that this double doctrinal point was accepted 1,500 years ago in the Universal Church, and especially in that eastern part of it which is now separated from Catholic unity? A reading of the acts of the Council of Chalcedonia and the documents immediately preceding it furnishes a reply to this question.

In an earlier article we showed what significance Pope St. Leo, who presided at the Council through his legates and officially confirmed it, gave to his role of Peter's successor and Primate of the Universal Church. (1) On that occasion we stated that between that Pope and the Popes of today there exists no essential difference in the nature of the policy. The differences have nothing to do with the nature itself of the authority exercised, but merely with the manner in which it is exercised. Here we are concerned with ascertaining whether or not the Papal claims of St. Leo were recognized and accepted by the Universal Church at the Council of Chalcedonia.

The complicated history of the Council affords us such a great number of testimonies that we are obliged to choose among them and report only on the principal ones. We divide them into two categories: 1.) testimonies immediately preceding the Council; 2.) testimonies taken from the acts of the Council.

We know the circumstances under which the Council of Chalcedonia was assembled. The Oriental Church had been plunged into confusion by the decisions of the Second Council of Ephesus, convoked by the Emperor Theodosius II in 449, and presided over by Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, to settle the affair of Eutyches, Archimandrite of Constantinople. The latter, accused of heresy, had already been condemned and deposed in November 448 by a synod held at Constantinople under Bishop Flavian. By ruse and violence, Dioscorus had succeeded in bending almost all the members of the Council to his will. The recalcitrants had been deposed, maltreated, thrown into prison, or sent into exile. Not only had Eutyches been completely exonerated, but still more grievous, an anathema had been launched against whosoever should declare that there are two natures in Christ (*duo physeis*) after the union. Thus the monophysite terminology, capable of covering the strangest sort of errors, was canonized, while the diophysite terminology received from the Orientals of the Antioch Patriarchate and elsewhere, was condemned. St. Cyril of Alexandria himself, who preferred the monophysite terminology while giving it an orthodox interpretation, had given his consent to speaking of *two natures* (*duo physeis*) in Christ when he

1) M. Jugie, *The Exercise of the Roman Primacy in the Orient at the Time of St. Leo the Great*, UNITAS, Vol. II, No. 4, p. 267.

signed the symbol of union of 433 by which he became reconciled with John of Antioch and his associates. In sending his legates to the Council, Pope Leo entrusted to them a long dogmatic letter addressed to Bishop Flavian, with the order that it be read to the assembly. In this letter, the Pope rightly insisted upon the duality of natures in Jesus Christ, thus condemning the Eutychian error, and recalled as well the unity of His person against the error of Nestorius. Despite all their efforts, the legates were unable to obtain Dioscorus' consent to a reading of the letter in a plenary session. He opposed it to the last. In so doing he rebelled against the authority of the Roman Pontiff, and indirectly condemned it in proscribing the diophysite terminology. We may easily understand the indignation and the grief of the great Pope upon learning from his legate Hilary, and from Eusebius of Doryleus what had happened at Ephesus. He did not hesitate to brand the pretended ecumenical council as the *Robber Council.*

The revolt of Dioscorus constituted a grave attempt against the Roman primacy, for even though it was not direct, it gained its effect through passive resistence and the will of non-acceptance.(2) For consolation St. Leo had the letters of appeal received at the time from the Eastern Bishops who had been deposed from their Sees and were being persecuted. Among these appeals is that of St. Flavian of Constantinople who shortly after died as a result of maltreatment suffered at Ephesus when leaving for exile. Another is that of Eusebius of Dorylaeum who succeeded in arriving at Roma in spite of the imperial police. Another is that of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus. In each of these appeals the primacy of authority of the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, is clearly affirmed. We quote a passage from St. Flavian's letter:

"Since, as if by a sort of conspiracy, all things were turning against me, after Dioscorus had pronounced against me that impious sentence, I appealed to the throne of the Apostolic See of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and to the entire council, properly submissive to the authority of Your Holiness. Suddenly a throng of soldiers surrounded me and impeded me from taking refuge at the holy altar as I wished, and dragged me out of the church by force."(3)

The appeal of Eusebius of Doryleus is no less impressive: "From the beginning," he writes, "the Apostolic See has had the custom of coming to the defense of victims of injustice . . . You preserve unshaken the faith in Our Lord Jesus Christ, and you manifest unfeigned charity to all the brethren and to all those who have been called in Christ. This is why I myself, finding myself in a desperate situation, in my anguish and affliction turn to *the only refuge remaining for me after the help of the Lord*, hoping to obtain deliverance from my evils . . . *Prostrate at the knees of your Blessedness, I supplicate you to annul the unjust condemnation which Bishop Dioscorus has pronounced against me* as well as the sentence of those, who, unwillingly,

2) Later Dioscorus became guilty of a direct attack against the Pope. As we know, the Emperor Marcian had at first convoked the Council, later to become the Council of Chalcedonia, at Nicea for the first of September, 451. The Bishops were faithful to the call, but the Council did not begin then since the Emperor, who wished to assist at the opening, was unable to be at Nicea on the established date. It was during his stay at Nicea that Dioscorus, forseeing that the Council would condemn him, dared to launch a decree of excommunication, approved by a small group of Egyptian bishops, against St. Leo. This attack is noted in the letter which the Fathers of the Council of Chalcedonia addressed to the Emperor before departing. Cf. Mansi, *Amplissima Collectio Conciliorum*, VI, 1097.

3) E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, II, vol. II, pars prior, p. 78. Quoted in the Encyclical *Sempiternus Rex*, Sept. 8, 1951.

have acquiesced to his will, and thus restore to me the episcopal dignity and your communion by letters addressed to my mediocrity."(4)

Theodoret's letter of appeal is quite explicit on the sovereign authority of the Bishop of Rome. Indeed it would merit a full citation, but here we must limit ourselves to certain phrases:

"If Paul, the herald of truth, trumpet of the Holy Ghost, had recourse to Peter to respond to the doubts of the Antiochian Christians on legal observances, it is with much greater reason that we, the humble and the small, have recourse to your apostolic see to receive from you the remedies for the wounds inflicted upon the Churches. *To you, in fact, the primacy in every sense is befitting . . . I await the decision of our apostolic see . . . I supplicate you to tell me whether or not I should acquiesce to this unjust deposition* . . . If you command me to abide by the judgment made, I shall do so and shall importune no one, awaiting the just judgment of God."(5)

The Bishop of Cyr also wrote to the Roman legate, Renatus, a priest. He begs Renatus to intercede in his favor with St. Leo. We cite the following passage: *"The See of Rome has the supreme rule of the Churches throughout the entire world* for several reasons, of which the principal one is that it has never been infected with any heresy . . . Whatever you decide, we shall acquiesce, convinced of your rectitude." (6)

Annulling the sentences of the Robber Council and freeing the usurped Sees for the persecuted bishops was a gigantic task for Pope St. Leo. The Eastern Emperor, Theodosius II, was totally under the influence of the Monophysite faction, represented by Dioscorus, Eutyches, and his godson the eunuch Chrysaphios. He remained adamant in his purpose and had the decrees of the irregular council applied rigorously as laws of the state. Every effort made by St. Leo to obtain the convocation of a new ecumenical council to undo the scandals of Ephesus was shattered against this obstacle.

However, toward the end of February, 450, the Emperor of the West, Valentinian III, made a visit to Rome accompanied by his mother Galla Placidia, and his wife Eudoxia. The Pope received him at the entrance of the Vatican Basilica surrounded by an imposing circle of Bishops. In tears, he supplicated the Emperor to bring his influence to bear upon his colleague at Constantinople, and persuade him to cease his opposition against the assembling of a council in Italy. Valentinian III heeded the Pope's supplications and proceeded to carry out his request.

We have the letter he wrote to Theodosius II. In it we find a clear affirmation of the Roman Primacy in its most comprehensive sense. He first reminds the Emperor that he should defend the faith received from his ancestors, and give testimony of his loyal devotion to the blessed Apostle Peter. He then asks that "there be granted to the very blessed Bishop of the city of Rome, upon whom antiquity has bestowed primacy of the priesthood over all bishops, the occasion and the possibility of passing judgment upon both faith and persons" in a council convoked in Italy, far from intriguing machinations.(7)

---

4) Cf. Grisar, *Neues Archiv.*, Vol. XI, 2, p. 364. Both the appeal of Eusebius and that of Flavian have been preserved in a poor Latin translation in Cod. 30 of the capitular library of Novara.

5) *Epistola* 113, *P.G.* 83, col. 716

6) *Epistola* 117, *P.G.*, 83, 1324. The phrase "supreme rule" renders the original Greek *hegemonia* which clearly indicates primacy of authority.

7) "Quatenus beatissimus romanae civitatis episcopus, cui principatum sacerdotti super omnes antiquitas contulit, locum habeat ac facultatem de fide et sacerdotibus judicare." *Epistola* 55 (inter epistolas Leonis) *P.L.*, 54, 859.

The Empress Galla Placidia seconded the Emperor's letter with one of her own to Theodosius, in which she speaks of the Roman primacy in still more eloquent terms: She asks that all judgment be confided to the Council which the Apostolic See would assemble according to due form, adding that she also recognized the supremacy of that See in which "he who, the first, merited to receive the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, has ordained the charge of the sovereign pontificate."(8)

The intervention of the Western sovereigns remained without effect. Theodosius II would have nothing to do with their appeals. Nevertheless, he did write to the Pope requesting him to receive into his communion Anatolius, the new Bishop of Constantinople, who owed his promotion to Dioscorus. St. Leo replied that he would recognize Anatolius if he would publicly subscribe to the *Letter to Flavian.* To facilitate the fulfillment of this condition, the Pope sent an Embassy to Constantinople in all haste composed of two bishops and two priests. When these Roman legates arrived at the Byzantine capital, Theodosius II had just died as result of a fall from his horse. His sister, the Empress Pulcheria, now regent, married the Senator Marcian and associated him in the rule of the Empire. These events were to alter the religious situation in the East radically, because the new sovereigns favored orthodox doctrine, and were hostile to the Monophysite faction. They gave their whole support to Pope Leo's projects. The exiled bishops were reestablished in their Sees. Flavian's remains were transferred to Constaninople with great pomp. As for Anatolius, he not only subscribed to the *Letter to Flavian* in the presence of the Roman legates in a synod held at Constantinople, October 21, 450, but he took pains to have the document signed by the Oriental bishops, especially by those who had given way to Dioscorus' tyrannical methods at Ephesus. He succeeded admirably in his efforts. St. Leo, who had requested the Emperor to convoke an ecumenical council for a definitive settlement of the Eutyches affair, now felt it no longer necessary. He was all the less disposed to the convoking of a council in the West, since it was at the time menaced by the invasion of the Huns. However, it happened that the Pope's letter to the Emperor requesting him to postpone the council arrived at Constantinople too late. In fact, on May 17, 451, Marcian had promulgated the edict of convocation of the bishops at Nicea for September first of the same year. When St. Leo received this news, he assented to the imperial will and sent four legates with the express mission of presiding in his name at the assembly which was to take place. He made a clear statement of this in a letter which he wrote to the council members on June 26, 451:

"May Your Fraternity," he writes, "consider that I preside over the synod in the person of the four brethren which the Apostolic See has delegated, namely, the Bishops Paschasius and Lucentius, and the Priests Boniface and Basil. My presence will not be separated from you, since I am present with you in my vicars, as I have this long time not been absent in the proclaiming of the Catholic faith."(9)

8) Epist. 56. Ibidem, col. 861-862: "Sua mansuetudo praecipiat ut secundum formam et definitionem Apostolicae Sedis, quam etiam nos tamquam praecellentem similiter veneramur . . . ad concilii et Apostolicae Sedis judicium transmittatur, in qua primus qui caelestes claves diguns fuit accipere, principatum episcopatus ordinavit."

The same passage is repeated in the letter which Galla Placidia wrote to the Empress Pulcheria. Epist. 58, ibidem, col. 866.

9) *Epist.* 93 *ad synodem Chalcedonensem. P.L.* 54, col. 937, "In his fratribus . . . qui ab Apostolica Sede directi sunt, me synodo vestra fraternitas aestimet praesidere, non abjuncta praesentia mea, qui nunc in vicariis meis adsum, et jam dudum in fidei catholicae praedicatione non desum."

These last words are an allusion to the *Letter to Flavian*, as we see in reading further. The Pope declares that this document is in conformity in all points with the doctrine of the Gospels, with the utterances of the prophets, with the teaching of the Apostles, and that it contains "the pious and sincere exposition of the mystery of Our Lord Jesus Christ's Incarnation."(10)

Speaking in this fashion, the Roman Pontiff practically affirms his infallibility. The *Letter to Flavian*, in view of the way in which it was received in the East, constitutes a manifestation of the Primacy in the doctrinal order. St. Leo made of it a touchstone of orthodoxy, and imposed it upon the entire Church as Catholic teaching in matters of faith. In his letters he declares several times that this document was composed with the *aid of the Holy Ghost.*(11) For this reason he will submit it to be signed by the Council which is to be held at Chalcedonia.

MARTIN JUGIE, A.A.

(*to be continued*)

10) *Ibidem*, col. 937-939: "Cum secundum evangelicas autoritates, secundum proheticas voces apostolicamque doctrinam plenissima et lucidissima per litteras quae ad beatae memoriae Flavianum episcopus misimus fuerit declaratum quae sit de sacramento incarnaitonis Domini nostri Jesu Christi pia et sincera confessio."

11) *Epist.* 89 *ad Marcianum augustum. Ibid.* col. 930: "Quoniam catholica fides, quam *instruente* nos *Spiritu Dei per sanctos Patres a beatis apostolis didicimus et docemus, neutrum subrepere* permittit errorem." Cf. *Epist.* 87 *ad Anatolium*, col. 926; See *Epist.* 130 *ad Marcianum, col.* 1078, where he declares that he who accept the letter to Flavian shows himself a disciple of the Apostles.

Cardinal Newman and Corporate Reunion

It is a truism to say that the harmony of Divine Revelation is such that to exclude any individual truth from its total content will ultimately distort the rest. The denial of one sole revealed truth constitutes the virtual denial of the truthfulness of Almighty God, and whatever revealed truth it chooses to retain is adhered to on human motives, not on Divine Faith. Sooner or later, whatever truth is retained will be distorted and thereby perverted. This process of disintegration is to be seen in the history of bodies separated from the Catholic Church.

At the same time, we can see a corresponding process in the opposite direction. Every truth of revelation calls for its completion with the rest. Men born outside the Catholic Church, sincerely seeking the truth, may find severally the various truths of Christianity until ultimately they find its complete expression in the one Church of Christ, under the agency of divine grace. Certain features of the Oxford Movement would give evidence of this fact.

John Henry Newman, who was the soul of the Oxford Movement, represents in his own person such a progression towards the Catholic faith. Having passed through a phase of evangelical individualism followed by a temporary recession into the liberalism of the Oriel Noetics, he finally gave a strong impetus to the feeble stirrings of a group of men groping for Catholic truth. The distinctive contribution which these men were striving to make to the Church of England (1) was the restoration of the dogmatic principle. Of course, the dogma which they had in mind was the voice of Scripture and Antiquity as seen through the eyes of the non-jurors of the 17th Century. From their studies an increasing awareness of the Church, as a divinely established Society equipped with teaching authority and sacramental power, began to take hold of them. Catholicity and Apostolicity they found were intrinsically involved with this society. At the same time, they recognized the predominance of evangelicalism and the threat of liberalism in the Anglican Communion: the one was a Calvinistic tradition which had been imbibed from the Continental reformers; the other consisted in a comprehensive indifference to dogma engendered indirectly from German biblical criticism. They conceived it to be their mission to restore Catholicism (as they conceived it) to the Church of England, which they believed was still retained, although obscured.

All of this had no direct bearing on reunion with Rome, as such. The Reformation view of the Pope as Anti-Christ still had a great hold on their minds and this wall of prejudice was, in some cases, insurmountable. Their primary concern was a reformation of the Established Church and a defense of her Catholicity. Questions of reunion were remote from their immediate considerations.

However, to trace Newman's ideas on reunion with Rome, it will be useful to see what his conception was (as an Anglican) as its starting point. To him, the Catholic Church was numerically one by Christ's institution, but presently it was divided and scattered into different branches throughout the world. In his sermon on *Submission to Church Authority* he wrote:

---

1) The terms *Church of England, Established Church,* and *Anglican Church* are used in this article in the sense of conventional terms to designate the religious body established as the state religion and depending upon the Crown in England.

You know time was when there was but one vast body of Christians, called the Church, throughout the world. It was found in every country where the name of Christ was named; it was everywhere governed in the same way by bishops; it was everywhere descended from the Apostles through the line of those Bishops; and it was everywhere in perfect peace and unity together, branch with branch, all over the world . . . That vast Catholic body, "The Holy Church throughout the world," is broken into many fragments by the power of the Devil . . . Some portions of it are altogether gone and those that remain are separated from each other . . . (2)
He conceived Catholicity of any given branch as lying in the succession of bishops. In 1841 he wrote:

The unity of the Church Catholic is very near my heart, only I do not see any prospect of it in our time . . . It is our theory that each diocese is an integral Church, intercommunion being a duty, (and the breach of it a sin,) but not essential to Catholicity. (3)

On a visit to Rome in 1833, Newman and Hurrell Froude conversed with Nicholas Wiseman, then Rector of the English College. They broached the question of Reunion and were disappointed to learn that the Council of Trent could not be set aside. In the following year (October 2, 1834,) he writes to his sister, Jemina:

To become a Romanist seems more and more impossible; to unite with Rome (if she would let us) not impossible; but she would not, without ceasing to be Rome . . .(4)
The progress of his views is well delineated in his *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, but, in the earlier days of the movement, reunion with Rome was not an explicit object of effort. However in 1839, an Article on the Donatists from Wiseman's pen brought the issue strongly before his eyes. In this article, the Anglicans were seen to be in the same position with respect to the Catholic Church as the Donatists were in the fifth century. "It gave me a stomach-ache" (5) he wrote to F. Rogers at the time. Later, in 1843, he refers to the same incident as follows:

Last summer four years (1839) *it came strongly upon me, from reading first the Monophysite controversy, and then turning to the Donatist, that we were external to the Catholic Church. I have never gotten over this. I did not, however, yield to it at all, but wrote an article in the British Critic on the Catholicity of the English Church, which had the effect of quieting me for two years. Since this time two years the feeling has revived and gradually strengthened. I have all along gone against it, and I think I ought to do so still. I am now publishing sermons, which speak more confidently about our position than I inwardly feel; but I think it is right, and do not care for seeming inconsistent.* (6)

From this time onwards (1839,) Newman was in great difficulties of conscience. He sought to justify the position of the Anglican Church as a legitimate heir to the Catholic tradition, yet privately he felt insecure and sought about for satisfying reasons. Just one month after writing to

2) John Henry Newman, 'Submission to Church Authority', Sermon XIV in: *Parochial and Plain Sermons,* (8 vols.) (London, Rivingtons, 1875) III, 191.
3) *Apologia pro Vita Sua, ed.* Wilfrid Ward (New York, Oxford University Press,) p. 280.
4) *Letters and Correspondence,* 2 vols., ed. Anne Mozley (London, Longmans, Green. 1903) II, 59.
5) *Letters and Correspondence,* II, 256.
6) *Letters and Correspondence,* II, 384.

a clergyman of the Established Church. Writing to Bloxam, intending the letter for de Lisle's eyes, he says:

It is impossible to read Mr. Phillips' letter without the deepest interest . . . This I feel most strongly and cannot conceal it, viz. that, while Rome is what she is union is impossible—that we too must change I do not deny . . . And then after all, I see nothing to make me think it would be other than a sin for any of us to leave *our Church. We must make our Church move . . Now these contingencies being so remote, or rather impossible at least in our day, it would seem that nothing is left for pious Roman Catholics and ourselves to do in the way of* direct *union . . .*

Mar. 2, 1841: *But surely we have enough to do, both they and we, in the way of mutual charity, without hastening forward to acts which should be its close, and not its beginning. I do not suppose that there is a single member of our communion, of any religious feeling, but would,* abstractly, *wish a re-union between them and us; but what we are all deeply impressed with, for one reason or another is its hopelessness . . .*

June 28, 1841: *In your letter to Mr. B. (If I recollect rightly) you urge persons whose views agree with mine* to commence *a movement in behalf of a union between the Churches. Now in the letters I have written to yourself or your friends I have uniformly said that I did not expect the reunion of the Churches in our time, and have discouraged the notion of all sudden proceedings with a view to it . . . If there is one thing calculated more than another to extinguish all hope of a better understanding . . . it would be the conversion by you of some of our members . . .* (14)

However, in spite of Newman's restraining influence, some of his followers saw the logical terminus of his principles and were impatient of its completion. W.G. Ward, Frederick William Faber, and J.D. Dalgairns began to tend Romewards. Dean Church noted:

The tendency of this section of able men was unquestionably Romewards, almost from the beginning of their connection with the movement. Both the theory and the actual system of Rome, so far as they understood it, had attractions for them which nothing else had. But with whatever perplexity and perhaps impatience, Mr. Newman's power held them back. He kept before their minds continually those difficulties of fact which stood in the way of their absolute and peremptory conclusions, and of which they were not much inclined to take account . . . It was when the tremendous question took shape, Is the English Church a true Church, a real part of the Church Catholic?—when the question became to his mind more and more doubtful at length desperate—that they, of course, became more difficult to satisfy . . . (15)

One of these addressed a letter to a French Catholic paper, the *Univers* (Wilfrid Ward says it was written by his father and translated by J.D. Dalgairns whereas others say that Dalgairns himself wrote it:)

The eyes of all Christendom . . are at this moment turned to England, so long separated from Catholic Europe. Everywhere a presentiment is gone abroad that the hour of her reunion is at hand . . . We are little satisfied with our position; we groan at the sins committed by our ancestors in separating from the Catholic world. We experience a burning desire to be reunited with our brethren. We love with unfeigned affection the Apostolic

14) R.D. Middleton, *Newman and Bloxam; an Oxford friendship,* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1947) p. 118-119, 122, 150.
15) R.W. Church, *The Oxford Movement,* (London, Macmillan, 1892) p. 239.

See, which we acknowledge to be the head of Christendom and the more because the Church of Rome is our mother, which sent from her bosom the blessed St. Augustine to bring us her immovable faith. ([16])

In 1844 W.G. Ward published his *Ideal of a Christian Church* wherein he maintained that he held the whole cycle of Roman doctrine in spite of his retaining preferment in the Church of England.

Finally, Newman retired to Littlemore for prayer and study with a few companions, ultimately resigning his clerical status in the Anglican Church and worked on his *Development of Christian Doctrine*. On October 9th, 1845 he was received into the Catholic Church at the hands of Fr. Dominic Barberi, C.P. The basic reason for his entrance into the Church he related in a letter to his sister some months before (in March:)

I began by defending my own Church when others would not defend her . . . I, in a fair measure, succeeded. At the very time of this success, before any reverse, in the course of my reading it breaks upon me that I am in a schismatical Church . . . Suppose I were suddenly dying—one may deceive oneself as to what one would do—but I think I should directly send for a priest. Is not this a test of one's state of mind? Ought I to live where I could not bear to die? . . . ([17])

So much for the Anglican years of John Henry Newman. We find in them no sympathy with the idea of corporate reunion except as a remote possibility centuries hence. During many of those years he gave adhesion to the idea of a divided Church in which the separate branches retained a certain measure of Catholicity which would suffice for eternal salvation. Reunion, if desirable, was not essential to the Catholicity of the Church of England. The nature of the Church of Rome and the nature of the Church of England were so disparate and opposed that no reunion was possible while things were as they stood. The increasing realization that the Roman Church and the Catholic Church were identical and co-terminous made it gradually evident that the English Church was no part of it. Human ties and the habits of a lifetime fought against the recognition of this fact. But one question superseded them all: "Ought I to live where I could not bear to die?" The answer lay in his individual submission. Four years after his conversion, he wrote to Thomas W. Allies, then an Anglican:

. . . persons like yourself should recollect that the *reason* why *I left the Anglican Church was that I thought salvation was not to be found in it. This feeling could not stop there. If it led me to leave Anglicanism, it necessarily led me, and leads me, to wish others to leave it . . . to leave it merely as a branch of the Catholic Church for another which I liked better, would have been to desert without reason the post where Providence put me . . . Moreover, he (the convert) will feel most anxiously about those whom he has left in it, lest they should be receiving grace which ought to bring them into the Catholic Church, yet are in the way to quench it, and sink into a state in which there is no hope . . .* ([18])

In 1850 Newman delivered a series of lectures on the *Difficulties of Anglicans* in which he maintained that the legitimate issue of the religious movement begun at Oxford in 1833 was communion with the Holy See.

16) Wilfrid Ward, *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, (London, Macmillan, 1899) p. 187-8 Cf. also Henry R.T. Brandreth *The Oecumenical Ideals of the Oxford Movement*, (London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1947) p. 24 note 2.

17) Maisie Ward, *Young Mr. Newman*, (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1948) p. 440.

18) T.W. Allies, *A Life's Decision*, (London, Burns, Oates, 1894) p. 157.

Though he does not use the term *corporate reunion*, his strong appeals to the consciences of his hearers makes a clear case against it. By this I mean he counsels prompt action to the stirrings of divine grace and against perilous delays and empty hopes of ever making the Church of England Catholic. It is the general contention of the reunionists that they should stay in the Established Church and so improve its ordinances and sacraments and teachings as to make it fit to unite with Rome. Newman probably had such in mind when he said:

You cannot change your Establishment into a Church without a miracle. It is what it is, and you have no means of acting upon it; you have not what Archimedes looked for, when he would move the world—the fulcrum of his lever—while you are one with it . . . If you would make England Catholic, you must go forth on your mission from *the Catholic Church. You have duties towards the Establishment; it is the duty, not of owning its rule, but of converting its members. Oh, my brethren! life is short, waste it not in vanities; dream not; halt not between two opinions; wake from a dream, in which you are not profiting your neighbor, but imperilling your own souls.*(19)

The whole series of lectures are a development of this general theme. His explicit views on the subject of corporate reunion are to be found in his correspondence with Ambrose Phillips de Lisle. This layman, to whom we have referred above, was still agitating for a corporate return of the Anglican Establishment, as such, to communion with the Holy See. In 1857 Newman answered de Lisle as follows:

You know enough of my feelings on the whole subject to know that there are some things in it, in which I am afraid to follow you . . . I mean . . . that the tendency of a portion of your pamphlet is . . . to persuade individual Anglicans to wait out of communion with the Catholic Church, till they can come over with others in a body. There is such an extreme difficulty in rousing the mind to the real necessity *of leaving the position into which men have grown up . . . that they will easily avail themselves of any slightest excuse—and even a hint from a person so deeply respected as yourself . . . is more than sufficient to turn the scale, when the mind is in suspense . . . they have individual souls, and with what heart can I do anything to induce them to preach to others, if they themselves thereby become castaways . . .*(20)

In 1866, in another letter to the same person he says:

I find it very difficult to realize such an idea as a fact. As a Protestant, I never could get myself to entertain it as such, nor have I been able as a Catholic. Nothing is impossible with God, and the more we ask of Him, the more we gain—but still, His indications in Providence are often our guide, what to ask and what not to ask. We ask what is probable; we do not ask definitely that England should be converted in a day—unless under the authority of a particular inspiration, such a prayer would be presumptious, as being a prayer for a miracle. Now to me, the question is whether the conversion of that corporate body, which we call the Anglican Church would not be in the same general sense a miracle—in the same sense in which it would be a miracle for the Thames to change its course, and run

19) J.H. Newman, *Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*, 2 vols. (London, Longmans, Green, 1897) I, 65-66.

20) E.S. Purcell, *Life and Letters of Ambrose Phillips de Lisle*, 2 vols. (London, Macmillan, 1900) I, 368.

into the sea at the Wash instead of the Nore. Of course in the course of ages such a change of direction might take place without a miracle . . . But I should not pray for it . . . I should carry the innumerable drops of water my own way by forming a new bed by my own labour—and for the success of this project I might *reasonably pray . . . To make that actual and visible, tangible body Catholic, would be simply to make a new creature—it would be to turn a panther into a hind . . . So that from my point of view, I cannot conceive, to end as I have begun, the Establishment running into Catholicism, more than I can conceive the Thames running into the Wash* . . .(21) This citation concludes the exposition of Newman's position on the question of corporate reunion; individual conversions alone will secure the return of England to the Catholic Faith. This can be confirmed by the words of Pope Gregory XVI to Fr. Frederick W. Faber (then an Anglican) in a private audience:

"You must not mislead yourself in wishing for unity, yet waiting for your Church to move. Think of the salvation of your own soul." I said I feared self-will and individual judging. He said "You are all individuals in the English Church . . ." Then he laid his hands on my shoulders, and I immediately knelt down; upon which he laid them on my head, and said "May the grace of God correspond to your good wishes and deliver you from the nets of Anglicanism, and bring you to the true Holy Church."(22)

EDWARD F. HANAHOE, S.A.

21) Wilfrid Ward, *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman*, 2 vols. (London, Longmans, Green, 1913) II, 115-118.

22) James F. Cassidy, *The Life of Father Faber*, (London, Sands, 1946) p. 43.

The Anglican Communion and Some Current Schemes of Union

Of the projected Church of South India, to which four dioceses of the Anglican Church in India proposed to secede and which temporarily at least, would not be within the Anglican Communion, the Lambeth Conference of 1930 wrote in these terms: "We rejoice that one part of the Anglican Communion should be found ready to make this venture for a corporate union with certain non-episcopal Churches. We feel that in a sense our brethren in South India are making this experiment on behalf of the whole body of the Anglican Churches. They are our pioneers in this direction of the movement for unity." It is the usual lot of pioneers to suffer exile and hardship from which others benefit, for those who come after succeed to their achievements and, if they are wise, learn by their mistakes.

The Church of South India, which in 1931 was no more than a scheme, was by 1948, when the next Lambeth Conference met, an accomplished fact, for the new Church had been inaugurated in September, 1947. The inclusion within it of Anglican dioceses raised in an acute form the question as to what attitude the Anglican Communion should adopt towards the new Church. Anglicans themselves were divided in their opinions and in the controversy that ensued the Scheme was thoroughly examined by all schools of Anglican thought, with the result that soon no doubt was left as to which points of it were generally acceptable, which parts caused a mild misgiving and which roused a strong and insuperable opposition in at least some section of Anglicanism. So the Church of South India has become the great object-lesson for schemes of reunion which involve Anglicans, a model of what may safely be done and what must be avoided, if there is to be a prospect of intercommunion with the Anglican Churches. In this it performs a very valuable function, because there are several such schemes in hand, and all of them have benefited by the South India experiment.

Before, however, commenting on some of the proposals for reunion at present under negotiation, it is necessary briefly to note the points where the South Indian Church has fallen short of Anglican requirements, because it is mainly in these points that the later schemes differ from that of South India. All these schemes have this in common, that they are attempts to provide at the least a working basis in matters of worship, common to religious bodies with different traditions, the main difference being that some —the Anglicans—are an episcopal Church, and the rest non-episcopal. So for instance, the Church of South India was formed from Anglicans, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists. Of these only the Anglicans possess the office of bishop and an episcopally ordained ministry: the rest, having no bishops, commission their ministers in a ceremony of prayer and, usually, laying on of hands performed by their fellow presbyters or ministers. As the aim in South India was to form a new and independent Church from these diverse elements, a Constitution had to be drawn up outlining the faith and organization of the proposed Church, and methods had to be devised to make the amalgamation acceptable and immediate. The principle underlying the Constitution was one of "a combination of different elements each bringing its contribution to the whole and not by

the absorption of any one by any other:" so there was bound to be compromise and statements broad enough not to offend against the traditions of any one of the uniting bodies. Anglican critics took exception to some looseness of wording in the sections that deal with faith, but an answer returned by the Church of South India in 1949 seems to have satisfied these misgivings. So the main obstacle that now divides the Anglican Communion and the Church of South India is the ministry.

The Scheme laid down that from the time of inauguration onwards the Church should be episcopal and that newly-ordained ministers should for the future be episcopally ordained, though this was not to be understood as casting doubt upon the validity of non-episcopal ministries, nor as committing the new Church "to any particular interpretation of episcopacy or to any particular view or belief concerning orders of the ministry." The Church was divided into dioceses and these were provided with bishops chosen from all the uniting Churches, who, if not already consecrated, were consecrated for the new Church. The great difficulty lay in how to absorb the already existing lower clergy of the uniting bodies, more or less equally divided into episcopally and non-episcopally ordained. The solution adopted was to accept them all, without further ceremony of ordination, as of equal status as "presbyters"(1) of the new Church. The situation thus produced is admittedly anomalous, and it is this that has caused general difficulty for Anglicans, because, whatever views Anglicans may hold on the origin and necessity of episcopacy for the Church (and they differ among themselves very considerably,) they are all attached to it as at the least a time-honoured system of ecclesiastical government and they are all bound by the rule of the Prayer Book that only those episcopally ordained may minister to Anglican Congregations. A further bar to intercommunion between the Anglican Communion and the Church of South India is that the latter naturally intends to preserve relations of intercommunion with all its parent bodies, most of which, of course, are non-episcopal.

At this point it will be just as well to try to assess a little more in detail the Anglican position with regard to South India and then we shall be better placed to appreciate the Anglican attitude to other similar proposals. As already stated above, Anglican opinion was and is divided. Quite a large section of Anglicans has no fundamental objection to anything in the Scheme, except the granting of equal "presbyteral" status to all existing ministers; but that is only a temporary expedient to meet a difficult situation. In 1920 the late Dr. Headlam published his Bampton Lectures under the title: *The Doctrine of the Church of England and Reunion.* If one were to try to reduce to practical form the principles he there puts forward, the result would be a Constitution in all essentials like that of South India. The faith confined to the Scriptures and the Nicene Creed with no particular interpretation imposed; no theory about the sacraments; no obligation of Confirmation; no divine ordinance of episcopacy and certainly no apostolic succession; no limitation on membership of the Church except baptism and faith in Christ, indeed no Church but a variety of schisms—that is Bishop Headlam's position (and not his alone among Anglicans) and the Scheme of South India could hardly be less definite than that. So, for at least a half of the Anglican world the real obstacle that separates their

1) The name "presbyter" is used almost exclusively in all these schemes, presumably as being a non-party title and as possessing the added advantage of having a New Testament flavour attached.

Church from the Free Churches is not one of principle, but of rule and of machinery. The rule is that mentioned above, that only those episcopally ordained may minister to Anglican congregations; the machinery is how to find a way of providing the Free Churches with bishops without offending either Free Church or Anglican susceptibilities. For the Free Churches claim most emphatically that they have valid ministries already and Dr. Headlam agreed with them; so their ministers refuse to be ordained, or re-ordained, or conditionally ordained by Anglican bishops, and nothing less as yet will satisfy Anglican hearts. That is the difficulty, and for many Anglicans the only real difficulty, to union with the Free Churches.

For the High Anglicans it is totally different, and almost all of the opposition to the Church of South India came from them. They demand an integral faith with no vagueness on essential dogmas. They want acceptance of both sacrament and sacrifice in the Eucharist; of Confirmation as a sacrament and as a condition for Holy Communion; of an episcopate in apostolic succession founded by Christ Our Lord. They have to be content with statements like: "The uniting Churches hold the faith which the Church has ever held in Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of the world, in Whom men are saved by grace through faith; and in accordance with the revelation of God which He made, being Himself God incarnate, they worship one God in three Persons, Unity in Trinity and Trinity in Unity," (2) which is excellent as far as it goes and no one can take exception to it. But it does not go very far; yet, with the addition of a statement on the Scriptures "as containing all things necessary to salvation and as the standard of faith" and the acceptance of the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds, of the two dominical Sacraments, of an ordained ministry "as gift of God to His Church," and of an episcopal organization, though "No particular theological interpretation of episcopacy shall be demanded from any minister or member of the Church," it is pretty well all that is laid down about the doctrine of the New Church. There is nothing that the High Anglicans can object to (except the vagueness about the episcopacy) because there is so little defined, and what is included in the statements can be understood in a Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, South Indian—or High Anglican sense. So the High Anglican, because the formulas of faith are too vague, is reduced to the position of the Liberal Anglican, who is quite content with their vagueness, and has to pass over questions of faith in his criticisms of the Constitution of the proposed new Churches and to concentrate on the mechanism for rendering them episcopal. (3)

Not all the schemes have exactly the same purposes in view. Those of Ceylon (Lanka,) North India and the United States of America aim at producing new and independent Churches like that of South India, but, if possibe, though not within the Anglican Communion, yet on terms of intercommunion with it. Others, like the projects being planned in Australia and Canada, do not envisage the creation of a new, combined Church, but only intercommunion, partial or complete, between religious bodies that will

2) *Scheme of Church Union in Ceylon*: Madras, (1949) p. 11. I give this brief outline from the Constitution of the proposed Church of Ceylon, because it is agreed among Anglican critics that it is the most acceptable one so far produced. It will serve as an example. The others are not very dissimilar, only rather more vague.

3) E.g. A criticism of the Ceylon Scheme in the *Church Times* of 9 Nov. 1949 can be analysed thus in numbers of lines of column: Introduction, 20; conclusion 12; Baptism 38; Holy Com-10; Episcopacy and Orders 126.

retain their separate identities.(4) For the Indian type of scheme episcopacy and Orders take an important place; in the other kind, communication of Orders is the only question involved. Though none of these schemes has yet reached its final phase, they are all sufficiently developed already for a clear idea to be got of their main proposals.

The Scheme for Ceylon has already been mentioned. It is the Constitution of the Church of South India rearranged, and with a number of significant alterations designed to meet the points which Anglicans have found unsatisfactory in the South Indian experiment. The projected Church of Lanka (or Ceylon) is to be episcopal. The new bishops will be consecrated by three bishops and then all the bishops of the new Church "shall receive by prayer and the laying on of hands by ministers of all the uniting Churches duly appointed for this purpose a wider commission to exercise their ministry in the Church of Lanka." All those who wish to be "presbyters" of the Church will be received as such by their respective bishops with prayer and the laying on of hands, accompanied by this formula of words:

"Forasmuch as you were called and ordained to the ministry of the Church of God within the.....Church, and are now called to the ministry of the Church of God as Presbyter within this Church of Lanka; receive from God the power and grace of the Holy Spirit to exercise the wider ministry of this office, and to nourish by word and Sacraments all the members of Christ's flock within this Church of Lanka, in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen

"Take authority to preach and teach the Word, to fulfill the ministry of reconciliation and to minister Christ's Sacraments in the congregation whereunto you shall be duly appointed. Amen."

The intention of the Church is thus specified in a Preface:

"The good hand of God being upon us, these several Churches . . . desire . . . to bring about . . . such a unification of the sacred ministry in this church as shall join together in one all the several inheritances of grace and authority which have hitherto been the possession of each Church in separation. In so doing, it is the intention of this Church to continue and reverently to use and esteem the threefold ministry of Bishop, Presbyter and Deacon which existed in the undivided Church."

And later in the same Preface it is stated:

"To avoid all unnecessary scruple it is hereby declared that the use of this rite does not imply a denial of the reality of any commission or ordination previously received by those now seeking to become Presbyters in this United Church; nor is it presumed to bestow again or renew any grace, gifts, character or authority that have already been bestowed upon them by God through whatever means. It intends only through prayer and the laying on of hands to secure to her future ministers whatever of the fulness of Christ's grace, commission and authority each may need for the performance of his proper office in this Church, and to provide a ministry fully accredited in the eyes of all its members and, so far as may be, of the Church throughout the world."(5)

The "Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan," in which Anglicans, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists are concerned

4) Nothing is said here of the recent conversations between the Church of England and the Free Churches because an outline of these has already been given in UNITAS III (1951) p. 43 seq.
5) *Scheme of Church Union in Ceylon*, pp. 21, 23, 24.

was published in 1951 after more than 20 years of negotiations. It hardly differs from the Ceylon Scheme (and so is the South India Scheme with modifications,) except that where the Ceylon Scheme leaves things rather to be understood the North Indian one often speaks out quite clearly: e.g. "While recognizing that there may be different interpretations of this rite (i.e. of the laying on of hands,) deriving from different Church traditions, the uniting Churches agree that the use of this rite does not imply a denial of the reality of the ordination previously received by those seeking to become Presbyters in the united Church; it does not imply the replacement of that ordination by a new ordination; not is it presumed to bestow again" etc. etc. as above (p. 10.) Like the Ceylon Scheme, too, the new Church will be episcopal from the start and with all its "presbyters" episcopally ordained according to a rite and formula substantially, and almost verbally, the same as in the Ceylon Scheme.

The North American Scheme (1946) was the result of conversations with Presbyterians. The main interest lies in its proposals about the ministry, which is projected as episcopal. At the time of union the ministries of each Church shall be empowered by the other in this way:

"Here the Moderator or Bishop shall say to the minister to be commissioned: 'The ministry of the Word and Sacraments which thou hast already received is hereby recognized; and the grace and authority of Holy Orders as conferred by this Church are now added.'

"Then the Moderator or Bishop with attending presbytery shall lay hands on the minister to be commissioned and say:

'Take thou authority to execute thy ministry and to dispense the Word of God and His holy Sacraments in this united Church; in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.'" (6)

This scheme of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, though it goes beyond the Australian proposals by aiming at ultimate organic union, yet borrowed from those proposals its method of the "mutual formula" for the unifying of the ministry. (7) It met with a very mixed reception, not only from the Episcopal Church at large, but even within the committee itself which conducted the negotiations, seven members of which drew up a minority report (there are ten signatures to the majority report) repudiating the whole foundation on which the scheme is constructed, and stigmatising it as "repugnant to the mind of Christ." So it is not surprising that the scheme has been temporally shelved.

In Australia and Canada the purpose in view is different and so the means suggested are not so complete. In Australia and the neighbouring islands Anglicans, Congregationalists, and Methodists are trying to find a way to allow their converts to communicate in any of their churches. In Canada, Anglicans and other denominations aim at a limited intercommunion —neither of these schemes visualises the formation of a new Church; the different bodies are to remain quite separate but at least partial intercommunion is envisaged.

The Australian scheme (1943) is simply this, that certain ministers of the Churches involved should be recommissioned, each Church by each of the others, by prayer and the laying on of hands and the use by all parties of this same formula:

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the wider exercise of thy ministry in the

6) Quoted in *Faith and Unity* (Oct. 1946) p. 43.
7) Cf. F. de Witt Batty: *The Australian Proposals for Intercommunion*; (London, 1948) p. 43.

Church, take thou authority to preach the Word of God and to minister Christ's Sacraments, in fulfilment of the ministry of reconciliation in the congregations whereunto thou shalt be further called or regularly appointed; and see that thou stir up the grace bestowed upon thee in the Call of God and by the laying-on-of-hands."(8)

The Canadian Scheme (1946) is the work of the Church of England in Canada and the United Church of Canada, which last was formed in 1925 by the union of Presbyterians, Methodists, and Congregationalists. The faith of the United Church was formulated in the "Basis of Union," according to which the amalgamation took place in 1925 and is generally acceptable to Anglicans, certainly to Canadian Anglicans who on the whole are Low Church. So the main question to be arranged in the recent negotiations was that of Orders. In this regard the proposals approved by the committee of the two Churches begins a novel standpoint: "We have considered the subject of the Ministry in both Communions and are of the opinion that these two Ministries are best considered as parallel to one another rather than identical;" (9) i.e. that "The Church of England distributes the functions of the Ministry among the three Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," whereas "The United Church distributes the functions of the ministry between the Ministers and the Church courts." (9) The practical solution, therefore, built on this foundation is that "each Communion should contribute the whole of its Ministry to the other" by the complete ceremony of ordination (with very slight modifications) as laid down in the respective ordinals. Anglicans would be commissioned by the laying on of hands and the following prayer:

"The Lord pour upon thee the Holy Spirit for the Office and Work of a Minister in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the authority of the Church through the imposition of our hands. And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God and of his holy Sacraments; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

"Then the Presiding Minister shall deliver to every one of them kneeling the Bible into his hand, saying:

"Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments in the Congregation."(9)

United Church ministers would be commissioned by the reception of the Anglican diaconate and priesthood. There is no mention of bishops in the Proposals because their purpose is not union of the two Churches with a single authority but partial intercommunion and intercelebration between two separate bodies.

The proposals of Australia, Canada, and the United States were considered by the special committee for "The Unity of the Church" of the 1948 Lambeth Conference. On the whole the committee preferred the scheme leading to organic unity (like the Indian ones) as being more consonant with the offer of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 and as more likely to lead to a real unity between Churches; but it did not condemn the attempts particularly if they could yet be given "organic union" as their final goal. For Canada at least this now seems likely. A Report of the United Church's Commission for Reunion, which has been negotiating with a similar Anglican Commission, urges members of the United Church "to seek to achieve organic union with the Church of England in Canada as the final goal of

8) Ibid. p. 55.
9) *Report from the Reunion Committee* quoted in *Faith and Unity*, May 1947, pp. 108-9.

our endeavour" and recommends as a step towards this the acceptance of episcopacy—without, of course, committing themselves "to any particular doctrine of the episcopate."(10)

Among the different ceremonies of unification outlined above, that of the Canadian Proposals is unique in employing the full Anglican Ordinal. All the others, however, reflect part of the Anglican formulas. The methods of Ceylon and North India, which purpose to take in all the ministers of the uniting bodies, are fuller than those of Australia and North America; and that of Ceylon has lately received the approval of a committee of theologians of the Church of England under the presidency of the Bishop of Derby. The report of this committee recommends not full communion (such as exists between the different Churches of the Anglican Communion,) but intercommunion (as between the Church of England and the Old Catholics) and intercelebration. The intention of Church of Lanka to continue in relations of intercommunion also with its non-episcopal parent bodies and the possibility of its occasionally inviting non-episcopally ordained ministers to celebrate Holy Communion at its altars would be "for some Anglicans a formidable difficulty." But as regards the Orders of the new Church, the committee is quite definite: "In our judgment presbyters thus commissioned should be accepted by Anglican Churches as duly commissioned and authorized for the same office in the Church of God as are their own priests."(11) So Lanka has got over the obstacle that baulked South India and, as the North Indian Scheme hardly differs from the Ceylonese one, it is to be presumed that that too will be approved by the Church of England on the same terms. How would the Australian proposal fare, were it submitted to the Bishop of Derby's committee? It was submitted to the Lambeth Conference of 1948, but no comment is recorded on the specific question of the value of the "mutual formula." If this "mutual formula" and the Lanka formula be compared with the formula of the Anglican Ordinal(12) it will be seen that only the Anglican one mentions the name of the Order being bestowed, but all contain the same ideas, though in a slightly different order; and the Australian formula adds a bit reminiscent of the consecration of bishops ("and see . . . hands:" cf. supra p.7.) It would seem, therefore, that as far as formulae are concerned the common "presbyterate" desired in Australia should be as valid in Anglican eyes as that of Lanka.

Yet one feels that the Australian proposal is much more unsatisfactory, because there is less disguise of the fact that the recipients from Anglican hands of the "presbyterate" (incidentally the Australian Scheme does not use this word; it retains "ministry:" here it is used to designate the hybrid progeny of these ceremonies of unification) consider that they are receiving no more than permission to a more extensive exercise of their ministry, but nothing different in kind. That was the reason that prompted the minority of the commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America to reject the majority proposals: and, one would say, that it was a sound reason and

10) *Church Times*: 12 Dec. 1950.

11) *Church Times*: 4 May 1951. Cf. also UNITAS III (1951) p. 192.

12) "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost frogive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His holy Sacraments; in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

"Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments in the Congregation, where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto."

inevitable for any one who thinks that bishops are different from priests and that priests are empowered to do what the layman cannot do. And that, I believe, was what made nearly half of the bishops in the Lambeth Conference of 1948 refuse to accept the episcopally consecrated and ordained of South India as possessing Orders in the Universal Church. That refusal was repeated by a significant minority of a committee of the Church of England in 1950, that was considering that same question. Yet how a committee of the Church of England approves of the proposed Orders of Ceylon though in what they differ from those of the episcopally ordained section of South India, it is hard to see. No one really persuades himself that those who yesterday thought bishops the equivalent of Church Elders, and priests the exact counterpart of a Baptist minister as regards his powers, believes today, when he is "recommissioned," that they have powers and authority shared by no one else at all—and that, whether the Scheme is of South India, North India, Ceylon, Australia, Canada, or wherever you will. It is true that many ministers in the Anglican Church do not regard themselves as more than "presbyters," but that is not true of the High Anglicans whose whole position is centered on the possession of bishops and priests in the full Catholic sense.

"For the past 20 years the catholic party in the Church of England has been forced to adopt the unenviable and unpopular position of opponent to the various schemes and concrete proposals for Christian reunion and intercommunion put forward in South India, the United States of America, Australia, Iran and elsewhere." Those are the opening words of H.R.T. Brandreth's examination of the Canadian Proposals and they are true. Each scheme that is put forward makes the position of the Catholic party in the Anglican Church more difficult, because each new Scheme has been designed to meet one or more of the objections alleged against the last, and though really and truly the last scheme is no better than the first, for they are all undermining the Anglo-Catholic position, still it sounds better: it offers less tangible points to be grappled with and it gains more support from the Liberal Anglican camp. So the High Church must go on fighting for the principles that it believes to be those of the genuine Church of England, but against steadily increasing odds and with, I greatly fear, a gradually diminishing prospect of success.

J. Gill, S.J.

Reformatio Reformata

A Trend in the Dutch Reformed Church

"We are convinced that the Reformed Church is obliged to make a new comparison . . . even in the case that this comparison should call for a new reform" (Declaration)

I.

In the Dutch Reformed Church a certain current has come to light which, while calling upon the principles of the Reformation, departs from its essential concepts. After discussions lasting over a period of several years, a group belonging to this confession has published a *Declaration* addressed to "all those who love the Church of Jesus Christ." To the *Declaration* they have added an *Authentic Interpretation* composed by J. Loos, Protestant minister at Hilversum, and J.N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, professor of the theological faculty at Leyden. The latter, however, is not a member of the group.

The document bears 29 signatures; ten of them are of Protestant ministers. The ideal they have in mind is a return to the Confession of Faith of the undivided Church; that is, of the Church of the first centuries, before any important schisms had occurred. They go so far as to insist upon the question whether a discussion of that profession of faith in the light of Holy Scripture would not be useful to the Reformed Church of today.

Both the *Declaration* and the *Interpretation* have been formulated with caution and prudence. An open break with the Reformed Church is not desired; the whole is composed in an irenic atmosphere. This, nevertheless, does not hinder the reader from wondering if this trespassing of dogmatic frontiers will not lead to still another in the practical line.

Given the importance of the question, we shall make a resumé of the pamphlet and follow it with a brief commentary. Since the *Interpretation* is presented as "authentic," we shall not cite the names of the authors.

The Reformation of the 16th Century—in the opinion of the authors—is not a point of departure nor is it a point of termination. It had been preceded by several reforms and if necessary will be followed by still others. The Reformation in its present status runs the risk of a sclerosis, of becoming set in an absolute form, especially in a land like Holland where it has taken a Puritanical form. Its positive value must be recognized, but yet it is not to be taken as a point of arrival. "It is a reform in a series of reforms."

The Reformers themselves proclaimed the principle: *reformata quia reformanda*. Would it not be possible to profit by the scientific study of the New Testament and the primitive Church to make a new reform of what Luther and Calvin had not completely understood or what they did not understand at all, and all the more so since they thought according to a mentality which has still not been sufficiently studied? What they did was not in vain, but it should, even so, give way to the conceptions of the *Catholica*, in which the Reformation holds an important place, indeed, but not an absolute one. The desire of the *Una Sancta* moves the authors to turn nostalgic eyes toward the one and "undivided" Church—toward the Church which once lived in the shadow of the Apostles, in which their spirit lived in all its purity, and which enjoyed the blessing of unity. Great impor-

tance is given to the seven Ecumenical Councils (between 325 and 787) which did not limit the message of the Gospels, but which created a wonderful synthesis with a door open to development. Emphasis is given to the Church's direction. It may cause no little surprise to hear a voice coming from the Reformed Church which says, "the minister of the Word, so as not to deviate from the correct road, may not dispense himself from ecclesiastical doctrine. The Church has determined, where it was necessary, the interpretation of the Bible's message, and if the promise of the Spirit was true in the mouth of Jesus, this interpretation is definitive."

At the end of an account tracing the origin of the Canon of Holy Scriptures, the remark is made, "It is, therefore, the Church which establishes that which is Holy Scripture."

The Church is conscious of being guided by the Holy Ghost when she determines this Canon. "Experience teaches that in substituting a *testimonium internum* for the Church, one either arbitrarily cuts a new road according to his subjective lights, or one accepts in practice the validity of the Canon on the Church's authority."

From all that precedes, it appears that the authors would subject to revision the Reformation's rejection of the principle of Tradition. This is the question which arises: "Is Tradition a human thing without any authority in reference to the truth and the faith; and do the Churches of the Reformation live without any ties with tradition, uniquely by and with the Bible;" that is to say: Does there exist in the Church a Tradition in which divine Revelation lives, which consequently constitutes an authority, and which is a valid source of life and faith? Professor Bakhuizen van den Brink does not accept Tradition in the sense of revealed truths, which although preached, are not contained in Holy Scripture. He is a protagonist, nevertheless, of Tradition, when understood as interpretation of Holy Scripture by the Church. We quote a passage here as typical of the relations between Scripture and Church: "The interpretation or explanation of Holy Scripture is one of the major elements in the Church's life. It serves to make actual the Word of God found in Scripture, as much for those who are the ministers as for the simple hearers. In our order we cannot distinguish a number of classes of hearers, because Tertullian remarks in this regard that the Lord has said: 'Your faith has saved you and not your knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. Because the letter kills, but the spirit gives life' (II Cor. III, 6.) This interpretation forms holy Tradition, and this Tradition is a sure rule by which the Church lives and which it cannot do without. The grace of God has formed in the Church, in the course of her history, powerful and vital treasures which she cannot deny at any period of her existence. These treasures form an uninterrupted and tangible tradition of the force of the faith. Through the Spirit God Himself is the Author. Historically it begins with the Apostles and continues even in our day even in every movement of grace. It carries us along as if in the flow of a current which can guide us in all security. It constitutes the life of the Church. It goes without saying that the Church also observes the Regula Fidei of her first times, and that it is deepened and broadened in its successive creeds and confessions of faith inasmuch as these and many other moments in her history have been brought about, and are still brought about by the will of God, as the proper work of the Spirit."

It is significant that by way of a detour, an "almost candid" usage has

crept into the Churches of the Reform. "While we with our mouths profess Scripture alone, we require of ourselves and of others faithfulness to the principles and to the consequences of the Reformation, which although historically and spiritually legitimate, has never been conceived of as an acknowledgment of a principle of tradition."

The signers of the *Declaration* do not wish to commit this fault of inconsistency.

II.

Although the Reformation explicitly confesses the Incarnation of the Son of God, it has not, according to the *Declaration,* sufficiently studied the content of this dogma. Neither has it sufficiently applied it according to its relevance to the total content of the Faith. Habitually the focus of attention is limited to His soteriological character. The Being of the Man-God does not occupy a sufficiently predominant place in the interest of the theologians. At times a more thorough study of the Being of Christ is rejected as "theological speculation." Nevertheless, it could be that a more profound study of the Mystery of the Incarnation would lead to a vast revision, perhaps a complete reconstruction, of current Reformed thought.

The *Declaration* itself already contains consequential revisions where it deals with the sacraments. Against the concept of the Reformers that the sacrament merely signifies and confirms grace, it claims "that Jesus Christ instituted the Sacraments *as means of His grace*" (italics are ours.) Baptism, for example, is the "conditio sine qua non" for the Kingdom of God, and it cites as proof Jesus' words to Nicodemus, "Amen, amen, I say to thee, unless a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God" (Jo. III, 5.)

As for the concept of the Last Supper, the author is of the opinion that Scripture is radically isolated from the concept of the present Reformed Church. It is incontestable that from the beginning the real and substantial presence of Christ in this Sacrament was confessed. Ignatius of Antioch († 107) declares that the *Docetes* have no part in the Eucharist for the reason that they do *not wish to admit that the Eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ.* (*Ep. ad Smyrn.* 7-1.)

He accuses the Reformation of breaking with the unanimous concept of the Church that had preceeded it when it *completely eliminates the idea of sacrifice.* The Reformation considered as a doctrine of the Church the thesis according to which the Mass is an unbloody *repetition* of the sacrifice on the Cross, although this thesis is merely a theological opinion which has never been declared a dogma. The Protestant, nevertheless, cannot deny that the Last Supper is a re-presentation (a making present anew) of the sacrifice of the Cross on Golgotha.

The Reformation, according to the commentary, has neglected, especially in Holland, exterior form. Because of the strong unilateral emphasis placed on the Spirit, everything exterior was regarded as superfluous and harmful adornment. Exterior forms were used only to the extent that they could not be done without.

The Word was made Flesh, and willed to take a visible form. It is, in the Aristotelian sense, the formal cause of the Church.

Anyone reflecting upon the doctrine of the Incarnation will allow it to exercise its proper function in reality; he will ask what the forms are in which the Incarnation manifests itself throughout the course of the centuries.

He will find the following forms: the Bible, the confession of Faith, the Sacraments, and the apostolic ministery.

Here the commentator approaches the so-called "Lambeth Quadrilateral," the four points of unity for the Una Sancta drawn up in 1888 by all the Anglican Bishops at Lambeth Palace, London. As secondary forms he finds: preaching, the study of theology, liturgy, and ecclesiastical order. Where these forms are found, there is the Church. Apart from these requisites one may find something else; it may be of great value, but it is not the Church of Christ.

One of the most revolutionary propositions, at least from the point of view of the Reformed Churches, concerns the ministry. The commentator permits himself the "singular audacity" of recognizing the ministry as "the episcopacy and the hierarchical priesthood that flows from it in the traditional catholic sense." This radical break with the tradition of the Reformation is justified by an appeal to Holy Scripture and the confession of faith of the undivided Church. The Elder of Geneva (with this title Calvin had hoped to supplant the Pope) is again replaced by the bishop.

Such a bishop would not be a figure invested with authority but having nothing of episcopacy excepting the name, as is found in some Reformed Churches. He would be a dignitary who, as a link in the *apostolic* succession, has received power from a predecessor, and consecration by imposition of hands. Every ecclesiastical system which is not apostolic in this way according to the commentator, lacks a divine foundation, and rests upon a structure which could be called a mere fiction.

It is in the episcopacy, of divine right in the Church, that Christ continues to live, as He does in the sacraments. Without the bishop, the very validity of these sacraments is put in question. This is a harsh statement for successors of the Reformation but it cannot be witheld since it has to do with the being or the non-being of the Church.

We can give here nothing more than a very brief review of the pamphlet, changing the order here and there to make it clearer for the Catholic reader. Yet, it will, we hope, suffice to indicate that its sense is that of a turning toward the Catholic idea which is unprecedented in the Dutch Reformed Church.

III.

The *Declaration* arises from a certain uneasiness troubling the Reformed Church from within. There are those who are disturbed by the danger of considering the Reformation as something completed, absolute, and consequently not sufficiently open to questions of the Incarnation and Tradition, ecclesiastical order and liturgy, confession of faith and sacraments.

It would be a mistake to see in this *Declaration* a banner under which a group of pilgrims is marching Romewards. They would probably remain at Geneva for a longer time than one would expect of pilgrims to Rome because much has to be done before the problems are clarified, and certainly much more has to be done before all the consequences are drawn from the conclusions.

It seems to us that the road as now conceived does not lead "ultra montes," but leads rather to that idea of the "Catholica" that is to be found in the right wing of the ecumenical movement. This unionistic movement is in itself a noble and a profoundly Christian one, but for the Protestants contains a paradox, and is tending to make a break in the Reformed ranks.

Leaving Geneva, one goes by way of Canterbury, or through the Paris of the Russian emigrés, but this does not oblige them to pass beyond the boundaries of the ecumenical movement according to the way it shaped up at Amsterdam in 1948, nor does it necessarily mean even going beyond the walls of the Dutch Reformed Church.

Sooner or later, it seems to us, that confession will be obliged to say its word on the movement if it wishes to avoid giving the impression of embarrassment through its silence. If it initiates discussions, they will certainly not be in the spirit of this new *reformatio reformata,* but according to the old concept that the essential points of the 16th Century must be maintained. It is our opinion that the synodal direction would lend itself to discussion with this movement at a round table, but certainly not with the idea of reconsidering the relation between Scripture and the Church under this new—and, indeed, very ancient—light. Furthermore, the new ecclesiastical order will never be crowned by a consecration of a bishop under the vaults of a Reformed cathedral in the sense of a continuation of apostolic succession.

Another question is raised: Will this *Declaration* not bear some influence upon the ecumenical "Catholicity" of the Reformed Church? Will it be completely fruitless in its endeavor to fix attention on the value of Tradition? Will it not arouse reflection, far too long neglected, upon the Incarnation, even beyond its immediate reference to soteriology, and bring to the fore the too narrow principle of the presbytero-synodal organization, along with many other points whose lack has impoverished the religious life of the Reformation's followers? Those who regret this impoverishment are by no means confined to the signers of the *Declaration.*

The impact of the *Declaration* will depend largely upon the number of those who sympathize with this movement. We do not know how many they are. There are grounds for supposing that there are consequential possibilities since this group is not separated from the primitive Reformed nucleus by a vacuum. There are stopping-off points between Dordrecht and Canterbury!

In any case, we see in this *Declaration* one of the symptoms which indicate that in the ecumenical movement itself the center of gravitation can shift from the Protestant wing toward the Catholic wing, and that there does exist a salutary uncertainty in the balancing of the scales. This struggle should not be underestimated. Serious men are participating in the contest, and are throwing the full might of their conviction into the matter of evaluating the Reformation, men who are conscientiously determined to make a choice upon that which is to be reformed and that which is to be preserved. We may rest assured that there where truth is sought in all sincerity, the Spirit of Truth does not remain neutral.

One should not be surprised if Catholics look with a kindly eye upon the minister Loos. One may not easily ignore that there are arguments in the *Declaration* that could be taken over integrally and utilized in Catholic apologetics. A doctrinal discussion with this group could open up larger perspectives upon conversations with the Reformed Christians. The matter to be dealt with would be especially that which is *not* said in the *Declaration.* It would soon revolve about the question whether there is any other succession that could parallel apostolic succession.

At the point in the *Declaration* where esteem is manifested for the

Tradition of the undivided Church we find a keenly significant passage: "Whoever meditates upon these things seriously will immediately perceive how vast is the untilled ground that remains to be plowed up." But whenever an earnest pioneer begins to dig into that soil, he comes upon venerable monuments which in their complex testify to many points of accord on the faith of that Church *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus.* Newman plowed that ground, and many others as well who could not find satisfaction in the Bible alone for their problems, and who wished rather to read the Bible through the Church. Here the Catholic Church herself is still at work, and if it should come about that she should one day meet with the children who once abandoned her, the most likely meeting place will be at the foundation stones of primitive Christianity where lie the martyrs, and the Fathers of the Church whom all venerate. There is nothing more barren than debates upon sole Biblical texts. Let the Living Church enter, and luminous perspectives are opened wide.

It would be a mistake to expect immediate results from dealings on religious matters either with the Reformed Christians, or with the Catholicizing group. One should, however, be aware that today there is movement in many places where ten years ago ideas seemed to be paralyzed beyond remedy. Only God knows where this holy inquietude will lead.

The attitude concerning this movement which we as Catholics should assume could be formed according to the final phrase of the *Declaration*: "Only union of prayer aided by a common labor will be able, humanly speaking, to open the roads by which the sowing of the faith in the Lowlands beside the sea, that was begun centuries ago, may be cultivated and brought to its full growth in the Una Sancta which embraces the Universe."

Before this movement within the Reformed Church Catholics cannot remain unmoved. We should look upon it with friendly interest, lending the aid of our prayer that the separated Christians of the Reform may find in their restlessness the occasion for a step ahead toward a rediscovery of Christ's Una Sancta, and the full realization of Christ's earnest prayer "that they all may be one."

N.G.M. VAN DOORNIK

Comments and Documents

DR. ASMUSSEN VIEWS CATHOLIC-LUTHERAN RELATIONS

It would seem that we need not hesitate to declare that something new has entered the religious mentality of our time. The irenical spirit is supplanting the habit of polemics, and instead of combatting each other as opponents, we find members of different confessions nurturing courteous and respectful relations. There is still something more: the will to study dispassionately the beliefs, activities and aspirations of divergent confessions with the sincere intention of understanding them as they are. The consequence is that Christians, however they may be divided in their doctrinal convictions, have found a means of assisting one another along the way to full obedience to the will of God.

The Holy Father touched upon this new trend when in his encyclical *Sempiternus Rex* he spoke of quiet research on the events of past ages being carried out without anger, without passion, especially in our times, and appraised this serene attitude as conducive to the achievement of Christian unity. In the field of theology too, it has become possible to look out upon the panorama of the present and weigh the contrasting views of divergent faiths in a spirit of charitable equinimity.

It was feared in Germany that much of what had been built up in the way of mutual understanding would be undone by the *Instruction on the "Ecumenical Movement,"* the encyclical *Humani Generis,* and the promulgation of the dogma of the Assumption. And yet, right now Protestant theologians are more earnestly engrossed in probing Catholic traditions than ever before. While temporary disturbances were running their course, a sound method of approach to dealings with divergent confessions was being reinforced and instrumented. Discussions with non-Catholics passed through days of trial, but were not halted. Under the discipline imposed by the Catholic hierarchy, controversies assumed a more pronounced character of scientific exposition. As a consequence we find discussion being carried on within accepted limits which permit each side the opportunity of learning the true significance of the other's doctrines, and the grounds upon which they rest.

If it is the truth that makes men free, should the Catholics fear any loss as long as these discussions are carried on by competent representatives? Are their doctrines not founded upon solid rock? Rather they have reason to expect rich fruits since the new atmosphere of calm and chastened discussion should favor the full exercise of that attraction which truth naturally has for the mind. Discussion in which truth is the goal should render great service in enabling the exponents of the Reformation to arrive at a total acceptance of the Author of truth in Whose name they all come together.

Observations reflecting this new dispassionate orientation upon religious differences have recently been made by the well known Lutheran Dean (Probst) of Kiel, Dr. Hans Asmussen. In an article entitled *Rom und wir* (*Christ und Welt,* Jan. 3, 1952) he speaks about certain movements, and changes of relationships between Rome and the Evangelical Lutheran Church which are being carried out "at a very great depth." But it is difficult to evaluate them; perhaps an understanding of them will have to be left for future generations. At any rate "there is no use in clinging to the appearances of events which have but a passing significance."

He is of the opinion that, both from the part of the Catholics and that of the Lutherans, Christians are getting to know each other in a new way. They listen to what the others say instead of forming their opinion on what it is supposed they would say. "Formerly," he says, "our knowledge of Roman theology was limited to our own dogmatic teaching and to stories of the 16th Century, when, as we all know, the Protestants were always represented as the 'good people' and the Catholics as the 'bad people.'" Now they read the authors of the other confession to find out what that confession really believes and says.

The trend commenced with Karl Barth. It was feared that such a tendency would lead to Rome. On the contrary, Karl Barth's position has now become such that he sees in Rome the greatest obstacle for the Reformed Churches, and "it is he and his circle of friends who fear for those who are more determined than he in their search for the One Church of all time."

That it is possible for the two different confessions to listen to each other is apparent from the fact that movement of some sort is stirring in the very deep current of relations between the two confessions. Dr. Asmussen does not think that these deep currents can yet be clearly understood or explained. He does feel that he can pronounce upon three significant symptoms which he presents for the reflection of others in the following form:

"1.) It is a historical fact that Rome became for us—and we for Rome—a real problem from the moment that the movement for Christian unity flared up. As long as we are urged onward by a desire for unity, Rome cannot be regarded by us as a closed and classified topic. It is very likely that this search for unity will not follow a constant line of progress. It will suffer reverses at times, as it already has. At least, from the Protestant side, in spite of the estrangements experienced since 1945, nothing can justify the old position of the closed file. The fact that these estrangements were determined in no small measure on our side by political interests speaks in a clear and pertinent way against such a position.

"2.) Shortly after the first World War the Dogmatic Theology of Bartmann appeared. During the second, Schmaus began to publish his. Between these two Catholic dogmatic treatises lies a grandiose development and movement that can be verified by anyone who takes both books in hand. One thing may be said without hesitation: Rome is in movement. Without attempting an explanation, the fact is that this movement is a reality. This means much, at least for us who are not Roman Catholics, because until now we have denied Rome the capacity of any movement on the dogmatic plane, arguing that movement was the domain of the Evangelical Churches.

"3.) At the same time, there exists among us a reciprocal movement, namely the movement toward remaining fixed. Even though Karl Barth tried to draw back when he perceived that his appeal to the faith and dogma of the Fathers was taken seriously not only by the Reformed side—although his disciples and friends even found it a characteristic note of the Church that she be in movement—the notion was inevitably lodged in our minds that a Church can subsist only in her unity, unity not only in the sense of the breadth of the present, but also in the depth of history.

"This is the significance of the Lutheran Assembly of Hanover for 1952. No matter how often a reaffirmation is made of that confessionalism which would have the Church's history begin at 1517, we know in theory that all

the preceding centuries are a part of it. And when this knowledge passes from theory to practice . . .!"

Dr. Asmussen claims that these three symptoms of the predominant current flowing at a great depth between Rome and Lutheranism undeniably exist. He looks to the future for their interpretation. We may also expect that in the future the newly generated interplay of thought and interest between the two confessions will prove beneficial, for of its nature it tends to reveal the Una Sancta which is not to be found unless it be in the Church ruled today as in past ages by the successor of Peter.

SALVATOR BUTLER, S.A.

CURRENT UNIONISTIC THOUGHT IN THE UNITY OCTAVE

LAST YEAR we attempted a general survey of the Chair of Unity Octave as it was celebrated throughout the Catholic world. This year we state that no less, and apparently much more, was done, and pass to certain significant highlights reflecting the progress of Christian unity.

A Calvinist Speaks

Le Monde of Paris published a series of articles during the Octave under the general heading "The Price of Christian Unity" (Jan. 19.) The first was written by the Pastor Jean Cadier, Professor of the Protestant Theological Faculty of Montpelier who makes an illuminating exposition from the Calvinistic standpoint. In discussing the price of unity he places the emphasis on faith and in so doing reflects an earnest striving toward concord of all Christians in Christ.

Barriers have been lowered in recent years; Christians of divergent beliefs have entered into live contact with each other. Yet, he wisely observes, "it must be recognized that progress is slow; we must recognize that there have been retreats, and certain positions have become stiffened." He says that an act of faith is demanded of Christians and that through faith the Church is known to be one. It is possible for him, however, to suppose that all those professing Christ are in some way branches of the vine which is Christ, in spite of their adherence to different denominations.

He makes an interesting quotation from Calvin's catechism (Chap. XV:) "Since there is but one head of the faithful, so should they all be united in one body, in such wise that there are not many Churches, but one sole, which extends over the whole world."

He describes the act of faith, which he sets forth as the price of unity. It is a whole-hearted embracing of the divine Person according to two aspects: as regards the intelligence, and as regards the heart or the will. The aspect of the intelligence demands a research in the theological domain which should manifest unity in doctrine, since revelation and truth are one. He finds that in recent years theological discussions have arrived at positive results. Fr. Braun in 1941 in his book *New Aspects of the Problem of the Church* spoke of a new agreement on the Kingdom of God and the Church. In preparation for the conference of Edinburgh, an agreement was accorded on the doctrine of grace and even of the Real Presence. It was in fact agreed that Christ is really present in the Holy Supper however the opinions might differ on the manner in which that presence is manifested and realized. He is convinced that God gives the divergent theologians sufficient

understanding and objectivity to set forth the many theological points of accord.

He is encouraged by the heightening interest in the study of the Bible as a means of ecumenical rapprochement, and cites the work of Fr. Daniélou, *L'Ecriture et les Chrétiens,* which points to this tendency as "one of the great facts of our times, and one of those of which the consequences are the most incalculable, and a new event." Paying the price of unity means advancing fearlessly in the common research for revealed truth in Holy Scripture.

From the point of view of the heart, faith means confidence in God. He says, "the act of faith demanded of us is to love God enough to recognize Him in the person of our brothers who do not belong to our confession." In this regard the price to be paid is Christian love.

One must not forget, he continues, the act of faith which is obedience. Here the Calvinists and the Catholics encounter a difficulty. The Protestant feels strictly obliged in conscience to obey the illumination of the Holy Ghost which he receives through the reading of Holy Scripture, while "the Catholic thinks that the will of God is incarnated in the sociological reality of the Church, and recognizes an authority in her decisions."

Despite all this, he concludes, an act of faith signifies believing that Our Lord's prayer "that they all may be one" will be realized; this prayer is the sole hope in the visible constitution of one sole Church. Above all else the price of unity is prayer for unity.

An Anglican View

Another contributor to the series was Dr. George K.A. Bell, Anglican Bishop of Chichester and president of the Executive Committee of the W.C.C. He reasons that a search for the form of unity must follow upon any genuine search for unity, and the ecclesiastical form is of the greatest importance. Christian unity requires agreement on doctrine, and how is it to be realized? Perhaps one could sacrifice some element, convinced of retaining the essential, but would one not feel unfaithful in accepting something from another confession? He continues, "I could, for example, be invited to submit to a supreme authority which neither my conscience nor my reason can justify." An exchange of beliefs could be repugnant to the conscience. There are great obstacles along the way of unity from the ecclesiastical viewpoint.

He finds cause for greater hope when unity is contemplated from another perspective, namely from the point of view of the salvation of the world. When one regards unity from this standpoint he is projected into the center of Christ's teaching on unity: "That the world may believe." The accent is placed on unity in love, and if unity in love is maintained as the directing principle the question will be simply, "What sort of organization is then required to express unity in love?" He is of the opinion that although unity of love demands exterior expression and organization, still, no one answer is possible, that there is no one single authority of spiritual gifts. The desire will arise among different confessions to communicate spiritual gifts for the strengthening one of another; humility is the ultimate price to pay for unity.

Dr. Bell's reference to conscience is an argument for the urgent necessity of prayer that the consciences of all those seeking unity may be so enlightened by divine grace that they may freely assent to the requirements

of unity. While his arguments do not seem to include the possibility of a church already unified, his means of preparing for the reception of truth by the exercise of charity strikes a sound note in the present day ecumenical effort.

Charity and Truth

A third article by Msgr. G. Chevrot also places the emphasis on charity. He says that without exception, "we have not loved Jesus Christ more than ourselves; we have not loved each other as he has loved us." He makes an appeal for Charity as the way par excellence to unity: Charity will lead to Truth. The Cross, with its purifying trials will unite us, and it is through them that God wishes to unite all Christians in love.

A Swedish High Churchman

Pastor Gunnar Rosendal, the Swedish Lutheran leader of a liturgical movement, contributes an article in *Le Monde* of January 26. His comments on the price of unity take an ascetical turn involving prayer and sacrifice. He concludes by wondering if differences between Christians are not of an historical nature which have no bearing upon the present day, and making an appeal for greater sympathetic understanding between Christians of divergent affiliations.

Voice from the Ancient East

In this same number the dissident Metropolitan Panteleimon of Chios makes an inspiring exhortation to unity. In moving terms he re-creates the ancient simile of the Church in which the many members are one as the grains of wheat gathered from many places become one Bread. The Holy Sacrifice of the altar becomes a living evocation of unity. It is his opinion that the fundamental differences between the Eastern and the Western Churches are insignificant. They existed even before the schism; today they are magnified by fanaticism. The Eastern and Western Churches will one day be reconciled, purified by contrition, and the Anglicans will follow along with all those Christians who believe in one God in three Persons, the Incarnation, the Redemption, the Last Judgment and final retribution.

A Catholic Wins Good Will

Fr. George P. Dwyer, Superior of the Catholic Missionary Society introduced a refreshing note of good-humored affability into the yearly interconfessional meeting organized during the Church Unity Octave at London, held this year at the Central Hall, Westminster. The Anglican Bishop of Oxford presided. Speakers were Fr. Dwyer, Dr. W.D. Maxwell, (Presbyterian,) and Rev. Francis House (Anglican, Head of Religious Broadcasting at the BBC radio station.)

The *Church Times* (Anglican) tells us that "Fr. Dwyer made the frankest, friendliest, and most sweetly reasonable speech on reunion that has, until now, been delivered by a Roman Catholic on the platform of the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity. He made friends with his audience immediately, helped by a puckish wit which stood him in good stead."

In his good-humored talk, Fr. Dwyer, who announced that he came with the warm commendation of Cardinal Griffin, spoke of fraternization and

brotherly love spoiling a good war. We can become more united in mind and heart now on the three levels of good neighbourliness, devotion and doctrine. Roman Catholics need to learn patience and understanding, and guard against sentiments of bad faith and misunderstanding. On the other side, understanding must also be cultivated; non-Catholics, for instance, should reflect before replying, and not retort automatically to a statement of the Holy Father on some vital current issue.

On the doctrinal level great divisions exist. The danger lies in a premature satisfaction in friendly association; it is too easy to ignore the reality of essential differences. The differences are a challenge, and demand intense action. The first step is to verify what the other confession really believes, then to concentrate upon essentials, and follow with decisions upon what is false and what is true. He also bore heavily upon the possibility of the Catholic Church ceding on non-essentials. As illustration, he cited the dispensation granted by the Holy Father to Fr. Goethe, the married convert from Lutheranism who was recently ordained to the priesthood.

In London's Catholic Herald

Once again the *Catholic Herald* of London supported the Chair of Unity Octave with live and pertinent articles. The editor, Michael de la Bedoyere, wrote an article entitled *Thinking on Fresh Lines*. He regrets the failure in England of forming a solid Christian front to resist secularism at home and agressive atheism abroad. He then passes to the fact that Christian union has a higher motive. The Pope has indicated his ardent desire for reunion by his interest in the Eastern Churches. Conversion is the only way that non-Catholics may be reunited with the Catholic Church in England. But conversion does not, according to the Holy See, mean a "take it or leave it" attitude. The Catholic Faith may be presented in the way best suited to the spiritual needs and the understanding of the peoples envisaged. Experiments are being tried, taking form both in a liturgical revival and in a simplification of Catholic practice of the faith. No hazard to unity and discipline of the Faith is involved in the effort of adaptation because of the modern centralization of authority and discipline which is the fruit of our own technocratic age.

In speaking of England's particular problem, he makes a positive appreciation of the Established Church, which says, "just because it could only survive as it does in England, it is a very English thing. It possesses something in its dignity, in its tolerance, in its ability to generate islands of high spirituality, in its belief in corporate worship which may well be a condition of the full return to Christianity in our land." He continues, "Non-conformity, too, in its rigidity and its religious popular emotionalism may well have carried something the English need *en masse* for a national faith.

Dom Bede Winslow, an experienced pioneer in the work of unity and the cause of the Eastern Church, follows an account of the origins of the Unity Octave with some pertinent observations. He gives the example of Mar Severios' approach to the Jacobites of Malabar, and quotes him saying. "I sympathize with their weakness. I do not condemn all their good things because of one or two faults . . . We must study their viewpoint and their teachings and explain to them the differences, using as far as possible the terminology they use."

He then turns his considerations to the Church in Rumania, and urges

the ideal that Catholics should be ready to make every licit sacrifice to make reunion easier for the separated orientals. He quotes Bishop Valerius Frentiu of Oradea Mare who was convinced that reunion in his country was not a doctrinal and ideological problem but a purely administrative and personal one. He declared that "if the union of the Rumanian Churches requires it, I am ready at any time to relinquish my episcopal see and retire into a monastery."

The writer then speculates upon the benefits that would follow upon Catholic-Orthodox reunion. Reunion in Malabar would mean the strengthening of the Christians not only in that region but in all India, and have its repercussion upon missionary work among the pagans. In Lebanon and Syria a reunion between Melkites and "Orthodox" would affect not only the separated Eastern Churches in the surrounding countries, but also the Moslem Arabs. In Rumania reunion would strengthen the "Orthodox" in the confrontation of Communism.

American Catholics Appeal for Return

In the United States, where, under the guidance of the Friars of the Atonement, the Chair of Unity Octave has taken on the form of a vast prayer movement among Catholics, the NCWC News Service carried a series of articles reprinted in the many Catholic newspapers of United States and Canada. From these we select salient ideas.

Fr. Eugene Figueroa, S.A., recalls that the Unity Octave embraces also the pagans among our own Christian peoples. Fr. Edward Hanahoe, S.A. National Chairman (for the U.S.A.) of the Chair of Unity Octave explains the responsibility of the Roman Pontiff in directing the Christian plan of salvation. He evokes the traditional figure of the Church as the Bark of Peter, with the Pope at its helm, and exhorts all the faithful to share in the work of drawing our separated brethren back to the church by their constant prayer if not by their activities. He also refers to the function of the Octave in obtaining the essential foundation for peace, and in this regard quotes Pope Pius XII who when speaking of the denial of fundamental moral principles in Europe says, "the Chair of Peter is the depository and exponent (of Christian teaching.")

Msgr. McMahon, Secretary of the Near East Welfare Association, in his Octave sermon delivered at the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception at Washington, finds a message of hope in the midst of tragedy. He says there is room for much optimism with regard to the return of the Eastern dissidents since so many have shed their blood for Christ's sake behind the Iron Curtain. He continues, "In our single lifetime more blood has been spilled in religious persecution than has ever been spilled in any previous century of human history. Some day another Julian the Apostate will be forced to come forward and admit: 'Galilean, thou hast conquered.' "

SALVATOR BUTLER, S.A.

NEWS

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Question of Lutheran Status Quo in Holland

At a conference of the Lutheran World Federation at Copenhagen in December attended by representatives of Lutheran churchmen from Scandinavia, Germany, and Western European minority groups, Prof. Kooiman spoke of a difficulty in Holland. He said that in the Reformed Church there is a movement in the direction of High Churchmanship. The Reformed Church is also suggesting that Lutherans should unite with it. A conference will shortly be held on this subject, upon which he feels the life of the Lutheran Church in Holland depends. (LWF-IS)

Lutherans, Calvinists and Ecumenism

For some time the subject of Lutheran confessionalism and its relations to the ecumenical movement has been discussed in the press in France. The ecumenical problem facing French Protestants in practical life is that of Lutheran-Calvinist relations. Many Reformed and some Lutheran churchmen see in the growth of Lutheran confessionalism a danger to Protestant unity, while others feel that a better understanding is favored by an ouvert adherence to their confessionalistic traditions. Lutherans feel all the more deeply separated from the Reformed community because of the latter's emphasis on adult baptism.

In the January number of *Fraternité Evangélique* (Paris) an article pleads for a clear distinction between the two communities. The plea is based upon the oath made by the Lutheran pastors at their ordination. It states the position of the Lutheran confession on the one holy Church. It would be, in a physical sense, scattered among various denominations. It is spiritually one through loyalty to the Gospel. Wherefore "a union of churches is impossible without complete doctrinal agreement." It would seem inconceivable to have intercommunion in the Lord's Supper with confessions whose beliefs are erroneous according to Lutheran doctrine. It would signify testifying to one doctrine in word, and another in deed. Moreover nothing can justify an exchange of pulpits since the Lutheran pastors must be faithful to the doctrine they have promised to teach and avoid increasing doctrinal confusion.

The article continues saying that relations with the Roman Church are clear since points of difference have always been stressed. The danger lies in the direction of the Reformed Church in the form of indifferentism. Common mission work, or evangelism, for instance might give the impression that the church's unity was being accomplished, but in fact they would be falling into the "sin of ecumenism."

The *Messager Evangélique* (Strasbourg, April 1951) carries an article entitled *Protestant Unity* which defends the opposite view. It is admitted that confessionalism can be an excellent thing—it is often a sign of religious vitality. It can be, however, "a renewal of that subjectivism which is one of the great Protestant ills." Intercommunion is dogmatically significant since it favors the realization of "how great the eucharistic mystery is and that it cannot be ultimately defined." The cause of ecumenism would be lost if

Protestantism were to pay more attention to its diverse traditions and creeds than to basic revelation, or if it were to cling to mere denominational loyalty. The article continues: "Neither Orthodoxy nor Anglicanism can contribute anything really dynamic to the (ecumenical) movement."

At the mixed Lutheran-Reformed pastoral conference at Bièvres last spring one lecturer concluded that nothing justified the further separation of the two communities. In his opinion, "the real divisions cut right across each of the two Churches." This conference was criticized by the French Lutheran Bulletin. Discussion was focused upon French Protestantism, not upon world Protestantism. The Bible permits only the choice between the local church and the church universal.

The debate is carried on with an article on *Confessional Lutheranism and the Ecumenical Spirit* appearing in the Paris weekly *Réforme*. It says "the growth of doctrinal consciousness (among confessional Lutherans) should go hand in hand with a clear stand before non-Lutheran expressions of the Christian faith." It is decried that some Lutherans "seem to be carried away by their own impetus and take up attitudes so paradoxical that we may ask whether their membership in the World Council of Churches still makes sense. In some cases the partisans of extreme confessionalism appear to appreciate in others not so much a doctrinal affinity as an attachment to a system that is as closed as their own." They ask only that the others' position should be strictly defined.

A reply appears in *Réforme* of the following week, under the title *In favor of Lutheran Confessionalism*. On the question of whether the membership of the Lutherans in the W.C.C. still makes sense, the author replies by trying "to imagine what the World Council of Churches would look like if it were to exclude one group after another until it contained only those who solemnly agreed with one party or one Church." He sees in the ecumenical movement a cause for the present confessional revival. The first *Faith and Order* conference in 1927 did not yet dare to set forth its basic doctrines, but it did not hide the points of division. The confessions represented were "determined to become each more conscious of its own faith in order to discover beyond their differences, that which unites them with Jesus Christ. Since then every Church has in its confession, its history and its tradition found its faith and its *raison d'être*. The ecumenism of the 20th century has abandoned that dogmatic indifference which arose at the beginning of this century . . . and which has caused Protestantism to become so tepid, indifferent and weak . . ." (from *Information Service* of the Lutheran World Federation, Oct. 15, 1951.)

New German Ecumenical Periodical

A new ecumenical periodical entitled *Oekumenische Rundschau* is being launched in Germany. The editor is Prof. Freytag of Hamburg, and the publisher the Evangelischer Verlag in Stuttgart. It has been warmly welcomed by Dr. Visser 't Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, and by Kirchenpraesident Martin Niemoeller. It is expected to be of service in preparing for the World Assembly of the W.C.C. to be held in Evanston in 1954. (NC)

Lutheran Ecumenical Council

The governing body of the established Lutheran Churches forming the VELKD (United Evangelical Churches of Germany) in a meeting held in

December at Berlin to convene an Ecumenical Committee for the study and preparatory discussions of practical decisions in the sphere of the VELKD's responsibility.

This institution supports the work of the Ecumenical Center at Frankfurt, and the German Ecumenical Study committee. Nevertheless, since questions of ecumenical union are essentially of a confessional nature among the Lutherans, it is believed that this Committee can be of considerable service in connection with the World Conference on Faith and Order to take place at Lund in 1952, and with the World Assembly of the World Council of Churches to be held in 1954. (EPS)

Project of Union in North India and Pakistan

A project for a union of Protestant confessions in North India and Pakistan has been drawn up following upon negotiations begun in 1929. The confessions involved are the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon (Anglican,) The Associated Churches of the Baptist Missionary Society of India and Pakistan, The Methodist Church, the Methodist (Episcopal) Church of South-Asia, and the United Church of North India (comprising nine communities of Presbyterian and Congregationalist origin.) The number of adherents to the various confessions is about one million. It is desired that other confessions, especially the United Presbyterians of Punjab, will enter into the negotiations. The Lutheran communities have abstained from any association with the proposed union.

In case of realization of the project, the pastors of the various confessions will perform a ceremony uniting them in one sole ministry consisting in a reciprocal imposition of hands, with the recitation of a formula indicating that as they had formerly been consecrated in this or that particular church for the ministry of God's Church, they are now called to the ministry of the Church of God in the united Church.

The project submitted to the various ecclesiastical authorities contains whole sections taken from the constitution of the Church of South India, and the project of union in Ceylon, especially in that which concerns the nature of the Church. The text of the new project is much more brief, since many questions have been deliberately left aside to be formulated with the passage of time.

The ministry of the church will be triple, exercised by bishops, pastors and deacons. It is stated that the historical episcopacy will be maintained from the beginning, although no particular interpretation of this episcopacy will be required of pastors or members.

It is the intention to seek for full communion with the Church of South India, and to realize complete unity throughout India and Pakistan. The member confessions hope to maintain such communion with the older communities from which they originate. (EPS)

Anglican Bishop of London Asks Adhesion to "Ecumenical Movement"

The Rt. Rev. J.W.C. Wand, Anglican Bishop of London, has published an appeal for adhesion to the ecumenical movement under the title *A Call to All Anglicans—The Claims of the Unity Movement.* In it he speaks of the movement towards reunion as the most striking feature of the first half of the 20th century. Future ages will be greatly affected by discussions which have originated in the World Council of Churches. He then presents the Anglican genius for "comprehensive" theology, which he sees not from a

Catholic standpoint—as truce between opposing trends—but as a synthesis of Evangelical and Catholic aspects of teaching. He finds hope in it as a model for the "Great Church of the future," which he thinks may be eventually characterized by such comprehensive theology of faith and order.

He then considers the reticence of certain "Anglo-Catholics" in giving their confidence to the movement. Those "who most prize the Catholic element of their heritage" should not see their opportunities lost by default. Others with similar principals are represented in the W.C.C. There are sections of Lutherans, and all Eastern Orthodoxy, which defend a like principle.

He continues, "Of course we can easily see that participation in the ecumenical movement is not so attractive to High Churchmen as it might be if Rome was an active member of it. They know that there can be no complete reunion of Christendom without Rome and they are anxious to avoid widening the breach with her." But Rome, he thinks, appreciates the importance of numbers, and would be "more interested in an organization that could command the mutual understanding and the complete cooperation of a half of Christendom than it is in the present comparatively small rival bodies taken singly." It would be reasonable not to refuse dealings with one part of Christendom because they cannot deal with another. He urges them to begin dealing with that part of Christendom which is open to such dealings, and thus make a beginning to the task of Christian reunion.

He finds there is nothing un-Catholic, in the narrowest sense of the word in participating in the ecumenical movement. The moment appears favorable for wider interest on the part of "Catholics" in the W.C.C. The Central Committee's recent publication, *The Church, The Churches and the World Council of Churches* in which it is admitted that some members do not regard others as churches in the full sense of the word should give them grounds for reassurance. This book, he states, gives ample room for the Catholic position.

* * * *

Around the World

ROME

Pontifical Approval of Friars of the Atonement

On January 5, His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, personally presented the decree of pontifical approval of the constitution of the Society of the Atonement to the Very Rev. Raphael Grande, S.A. Fr. Grande is a former Superior General of the Friars of the Atonement, and was the successor of their founder, Fr. Paul James Francis Wattson, S.A. His Eminence, Nicholas Cardinal Canali presented Fr. Grande to the Pope for this occasion.

The decree of approval, known as the *Decretum Laudis,* and issued by the Sacred Congregation of Religious, raises the Society of the Atonement, a branch of the Third Order Regular of St. Francis, from the level of diocesan right to that of pontifical right.

The Society of the Atonement has done eminent work in the field of Christian unity, and especially in the propagation of the Chair of Unity Octave. UNITAS readers will recall that it has assumed the responsibility of printing the English edition of this review.

The Society was founded in 1899 at Graymoor, Garrison, N.Y., U.S.A.,

by the Rev. Lewis Thomas Wattson, then an Anglican clergyman, who has since become universally known as Fr. Paul Wattson. Contemporaneously, the Sisters of the Atonement were founded by Mother Lurana White. In 1908 Fr. Paul launched the Chair of Unity Octave. On October 30, 1909 both communities were received corporately into the Catholic Church.

The Friars' community now numbers some 200 members, and the Sisters' community about 400 members. The present Superior General is the Very Rev. Fr. Angelus Delahunt, S.A.

Catholic Rumanian Mission for Europe

A *Catholic Rumanian Mission for Europe* was established by the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church under date of February 12. The purpose of this mission is to give spiritual and material assistance to Rumanians in exile, now dwelling in the various countries of free Europe, as well as to promote and coordinate activities in their favour.

Msgr. John C. Kirk, former Secretary of the Nunciature at Bucarest, has been named President of this new organization, as well as Rector of the Rumanian Mission in Spain (cf. UNITAS, Vol. III, No. 4, p. 244.) He will reside at Serrano 30, Madrid. The Rev. Octavian Barlea has been appointed Vice-President, and will collaborate with Msgr. Kirk. He has also been appointed Rector of the Rumanian Mission in France, and will reside at 38 rue Ribera, Paris.

Fr. Barlea has done noteable work as head of the Vatican Relief Commission for Rumanians in Germany, with center at Kronberg. He is as well a scholar of note; he did his theological studies at Blaj, and at the Oriental Institute at Rome.

Rev. Alexander Mircea, former Secretary of UNITAS, and of AIRI (Association of Intellectual Refugees in Italy,) has been appointed assistant to Msgr. Kirk, both as President of the European Mission, and as Rector of the Mission in Spain.

Rectors of missions in other countries, which will depend upon the general European Mission, are to be named in the near future.

* * * *

ITALY

Persecution in Rumania Favors Reunion

At a cultural gathering of Rumanian refugees, mostly from the refugee camps of Bari and Santeramo, organized by the Congregation of "Our Lady of Good Counsel" at the Church of the Gesù at Bari in February, His Excellence Mimmi, Archbishop of Bari, presiding and attended by distinguished personages of the region, Prof. Dmitri Marin made a significant comment on the consequences of persecution in Rumania, where the Communistic regime directs its most vehement force against Catholics of both Oriental and Latin rite. After referring to the great cause of the Chair of Unity Octave, he commented upon the example that Rumanian Catholics have given to their compatriots. The Rumanian people now tend to associate the cause of those who have suffered martyrdom for the Catholic faith with that of their suffering nation. From this very tribulation springs a new hope of reunion of the separated Rumanian Church with the Universal Church of Rome.

New Seminary at Piana degli Albanesi

A new Seminary of Byzantine rite for the Albanian Eparchy of Piana, Sicily, was inaugurated in October. The Seminary was erected with funds provided by the Sacred Congregation of the Oriental Church. His Eminence Cardinal Ruffini, as Apostolic Administrator of the Eparchy of Piana, presided at the ceremonies.

The Albanians of Sicily are descendents of those who fled their homeland to preserve their faith five centuries ago. They have preserved their traditions, rite, and language in Sicily.

Protestant Relations with the Government

The Federal Council of Evangelical Churches in Italy, according to its president, Dr. Emanuele Sbaffi, has filed an application requesting the government to bring up to date the legal status of the Protestant churches in Italy. Such relations still operate under the fascist law passed in 1929. It is hoped to secure action on an agreement during the current winter season. Dr. Sbaffi explains that the move does not spring from difficulties with the government. The Council is merely urging the government to draw up the "understandings" or "agreements" promised to religious bodies other than the Roman Catholic Church in article 8 of the constitution.

The Federal Council is composed of the Baptist, Methodist, and Waldensian religious bodies in Italy. The Adventist and Pentecostal or Assembly of God sects and the Salvation Army are associates, but do not enjoy full membership. The Pentecostal group has not been recognized by the government. (NC)

* * * *

UNITED STATES

Report of Msgr. McMahon to Catholic Near East Welfare Board

In submitting a report on the CNEWA and the Pontifical Mission for Palestine to the board of directors of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association last November, Msgr. McMahon (national director of CNEWA, and president of the Mission for Palestine, of which the CNEWA is the American component) stated that the refugee problem in Palestine is by no means settled. Relief work must continue until essential justice is done to the hundreds of thousands expelled from their homes. He called upon Catholics in the U.S. to remember that by their aid they "not only perpetuate the presence of the Holy Father among the homeless and the hungry, but they also reaffirm the fact that there is a Christian stake in Palestine, and that the sacred footprints of Our Lord can never be blotted out of that land." (NC)

Silver Anniversary of CNEWA

The Silver Anniversary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association was commemorated last November with a Solemn Vesper Service at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City, with Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, presiding.

Bishop Bryan J. McEntegart of Ogdensburg, former national secretary, was celebrant; another former secretary, Msgr. James B. O'Reilly, preached the sermon. He was introduced by the present national secretary, Msgr.

Thomas J. MacMahon, who is also president of the Pontifical Commission for Palestine.

A number of the Fathers of the Friars of the Atonement, led by their Superior General, Very Rev. Angelus Delahunt, S.A., assisted at the ceremony in memory of their Founder, Fr. Paul James Francis, S.A., who had had a large part in the founding of the Association, and was its first vice president.

The CNEWA was formed in 1926 when Pope Pius XI consolidated three existing Near East relief societies in America. The new association was entrusted with the support of missionary endeavors in Greece and the Balkans, in a dozen Middle Eastern countries, and in sections of the southern part of India.

Originally the Association had the scope of relief work. Gradually this type of work became less necessary. In 1931, Archbishop Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, at that time Assessor of the Oriental Congregation in Rome, was sent to the United States to reorganize the CNEWA as an exclusive mission aid society for the Near East. When His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman became Archbishop of New York he succeeded Cardinal Hayes as president of the Association.

A booklet commemorating the Silver Jubilee, entitled "Silver Threads," notes the variety of rites and languages in which the Catholic Church is "decked out as a queen."

In speaking of the dissidents, reference is made to the encyclical *Sempiternus Rex*, where Pope Pius XII says, "Following the footsteps of our predecessors, we have constantly labored to make the return to the Catholic Church easier for the Eastern Christians. We have defended their legitimate rites, promoted research with regard to them, promulgated laws to provide for them . . ." The booklet then declares that the CNEWA in this spirit has lost no opportunity to make this ancient Eastern Christianity known to the American people.

The booklet pays tribute to the Very Rev. Paul James Francis, S. A., who was also the founder of the Chair of Unity Octave, "which has brought countless faithful into the Church" and is celebrated with special fervor in the Near East countries, and was responsible in great measure for the return of the Malankarese Christians who followed Mar Ivanios back to union with the Roman Church. (NC)

Byzantine Rite Seminary at Pittsburgh Dedicated

A new seminary to serve Byzantine-rite students of Podcarpathian-Ruthenian extraction at Pittsburgh was dedicated last October by Bishop Daniel Ivancho of the Pittsburgh Byzantine-rite exarchate.

The new seminary has facilities for 100 students and eight professors besides accomodations for recreation and various activities. The chapel is richly ornamented according to the Byzantine tradition, and is surmounted by a cross and slightly spiralled dome modelled upon that of the Church of St. Basil the Blessed at Moscow. A permanent outdoor altar has been erected at the back of the chapel.

The seminary will receive both major and minor seminarians. Forty-eight students of theology and 18 students of philosophy have already begun their studies there. A first-year class of minor seminarians is expected to commence this year.

Programme for Education of Lithuanian Priests

A programme to educate youth of Lithuanian descent now living in more than half a dozen countries to serve as priests in Lithuania when conditions permit has been put into operation. His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, has been named honorary president of a committee in charge of the project. Rev. Dr. Joseph B. Koncius is executive director and general secretary.

Three exiled Lithuanian prelates are officers of the committee. They are: Archbishop Joseph Skvireckas of Kaunas, president; Bishop Vincent Padolskis, former Administrator of Vilkaviskis, vice president, and Bishop Vincent Brizgys, Auxiliary of Kaunas, treasurer.

Fr. Koncius reports that there are about 1,000,000 persons of Lithuanian descent in the United States; about 100,000 in South America countries, about 20,000 in Britain, and 20,000 in Canada. The programme will be carried out in the United States, England, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Latin-America nations.

Students, who must be between the ages of 17 and 25 with the equivalent of a high school education, will be trained at Marian Hill Seminary, operated by the Marian Fathers at Hinsdale, Ill., and at St. Casimir's College, the Lithuanian college in Rome.

Whereas previously there were about 2,000 priests serving in Lithuania, there are now less than 200 there. It is hoped that about 200 priests for Lithuania can be trained through the above programme. (NC)

Observations on Approach to Protestants

Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, writer and former Congresswoman, a convert to the Catholic faith, made suggestions on the Catholic approach to the Protestant mind when speaking at the ninth national congress of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine held in Chicago last November.

She said that "the heart is the main organ with which the non-Catholic approaches questions of Faith . . . Words stir, but actions will move people to the Faith. It is the great Protestant heart of America with its native good will, its eagerness to serve, its tremendous appetite to love, in short its vast residue of Christian faith, hope and charity, which provides the would-be apostle with his best opportunity."

In her opinion the typical Protestant does not have the habit of applying his intellect to matters of worship, and it is consequently futile to attempt to convince such a one with intellectual arguments. The person who "goes out of his way to give them evidence of Catholic compassion and sympathy, who does them, in distress, some service or kindness that was not to be expected" is more likely to succeed in winning them over to an appreciation of the Catholic Faith. She added, "If we will only love enough our love will lead others to our Faith." (NC)

Visit of Cardinal Agagianian

His Eminency Gregory Peter XV Cardinal Agagianian, Patriarch of Clilicia of the Armenians arrived in the United States last November for a two months' visit. The principal cities in his tour were Boston, Washington, New York, Philadelphia, Detroit, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Fresno, California. The latter city is the largest center of Armenians in

the United States. His visit also included various points in Canada. He came to the United States as guest of Archbishop Cushing of Boston.

Speaking at Washington, His Eminence expressed the conviction that there are still many thousands of Armenian Catholics behind the Iron Curtain. When communists seized power in Russia after World War I there were about 75,000 Armenian Catholics spread about different parts of that country, administered by about 50 priests. About 10,000 were in the Republic of Armenia. They had no Bishop, and many of the priests have died. There are at present about 4,000,000 Armenians dispersed throughout the world. The Cardinal celebrated the Armenian Liturgy solemnly in many points and thus not only gave countless Armenians the opportunity of gathering in solemn worship in their own rite, but gave many others the occasion of appreciating this ancient Oriental liturgy.

Wide Observance of Bible Week Planned

For the year 1952 a "Bible Week" will replace the "Biblical Sunday" which has been observed in recent years, according to Rev. Louis Hartman, C.S.S.R., general secretary of the Catholic Biblical Association of America. Plans have been completed in cooperation with the National Center of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and seven Bible publishing firms for a wide observance in churches, schools, colleges, and seminaries. Both the press and radio will carry numerous Bible features during the week. (NC)

Book for Following Maronite Mass

An illustrated book entitled *A Method for Attending the Maronite Mass* has been written and published by Rev. John Trad at San Antonio, Texas. It contains an English translation of the Syriac prayers, along with the Epistles and Gospels.

There are many Maronites now in the United States where they have built nearly 50 of their own churches. (NC)

* * * *

CANADA

Translation of Gospels from Original Tongues

The Catholic Association, last November, announced completion of an annotated translation from the original Greek and Aramaic of the Four Gospels by Canadian scholars. The work represents a labor of six years. It has been issued in an illustrated popular edition of 320 pages.

The work was undertaken at the request of the late Rodrigue Cardinal Villeneuve, Archbishop of Quebec, who asked professors of Sacred Scripture in the various seminaries and scholasticates to make a translation of the New Testament. (NC)

Sixtieth Anniversary of Arrival of Ukrainian Catholics

A Divine Liturgy in Ruthenian rite was celebrated in St. Mary's Cathedral, Kingston, Ontario, in November, to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the arrival of Ukrainian Catholics in Canada. The Divine Liturgy in Ruthenian rite was celebrated by Bishop Isidore Borecky, Ukrainian Apostolic Exarch of Eastern Canada, with Archbishop O'Sullivan of Kingston presiding.

Studite Monks Arrive in Canada

Last autumn 11 Studite monks arrived in Canada. They had come from Belgium with the assistance of Bishop Isidore Borecky, Apostolic Exarch of Toronto. The Redemptorists, as a temporary measure, have put at their disposition a wing of their convent building at Woodstock, Ontario. Since they are of diocesan rite, Bishop Borecky named Fr. Dmitri Kowalchik of the Benedictine Abbey of St. Procopius, Lisle, Illinois, U.S.A., as their superior.

These Studite monks were founded in 1900, and received their first Constitutions from the Metropolitan Szeptyckyj in 1906. They had three monasteries: at Univ, at Zarvanitsa, and at Lviv-Lycakiv. Three dependent houses were at Lviv, Khutori Merlinski, and at Zaboloti. Before the Russian occupation of Galizia they numbered more than 100 monks.

The group which has now come to Canada had first fled to Buke in Germany. From Buke they went to Belgium where they were received as guests of the Benedictine Priory of Chevetogne. (SICO)

* * * *

GERMANY

Journal of Russian Dissidents in Germany

The first number of a new journal, *The Voice of Orthodoxy,* organ of the dissident Russian diocese in Germany depending upon the Moscow Patriarchate, has appeared.

The editorial statement of its scope states that its basic purpose is the service of peace among men and in particular, a reconciliation and union of the "Orthodox" bishops, clergy and laymen who now live in diaspora with the Russian Mother Church in the person of its "legal representative, the Moscow Patriarchate." It will interest itself in the life of the Russian Orthodox Church, and "will at the same time aid in the task of rapprochement of all non-Orthodox Christian confessions of the West, with the Orthodox East, on the basis of the fullness and truth which is the Grace of the Church."

* * * *

ENGLAND

Plans for Faith and Order Conference at Lund

The Executive Committee of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches met at Lambeth Palace at the end of January under the chairmanship of Archbishop Yngve Brilioth (Lutheran) of Upsala. Final plans were drawn up for the third world conference on Faith and Order to be held at Lund, Sweden, August 15-28, 1952.

Rev. Oliver Tomkins, Secretary of the Commission, announced that 170 churches in 43 countries had been invited to send representatives. It will be attended by about 200 delegates and 200 visitors.

The Conference will consider reports prepared by the three theological sub-commissions set up after the second world Conference on Faith and Order at Edinburgh, 1937: 1) the doctrine of the Church; 2) ways of worship; 3) intercommunion. An invitation to send representatives has been sent to the dissident Oriental Church and the Free Churches in Russia, but no definite acceptance has yet been received from them. (EPS)

FRANCE

Russian Translation of New Testament

A commission has been organized for the translation of the New Testament into modern Russian. The Commission has been working for six months under the direction of Mr. Donald A. Lowrie, Secretary of the Christian youth unions at Paris. Among the members of the commission are Dr. Bradnock, of the British and Foreign Bible Society, Bishop Cassien, Profs. Lossky and Weidle, Sové (Helsinki,) and Obolensky (Oxford.) This project, supported by the British and Foreign Bible Society, will be carried out in close collaboration with Bishop Cassien, who is the chief reviser. Another translation of the New Testament into Russian was made several years ago and published under the direction of Fr. Schweigl, S.J., of the Russicum College of Rome. (EPS)

* * * *

HOLLAND

Plans for Celebration of Hierarchy's Restoration

A group known as "Foundation 1853-1953" consisting of chairmen of six Catholic groups in the Netherlands, and other leaders, is now making plans for the centenary celebration of the Dutch Hierarchy which was restored on March 4, 1853.

It is of interest that the headquarters for the preparations are located in a large room known as Our Lord of the Garrets. The faithful of Amsterdam gathered in this room to worship secretly more than two centuries ago. (NC)

* * * *

SPAIN

New Byzantine-rite Chapel

A new chapel of Byzantine rite has recently been inaugurated at the headquarters of the Center of Oriental Studies (*Centro de Estudios Orientales* —CEOR) at Madrid. This organization has as director Fr. Santiago Morillo, S.J., indefatigable proponent of the cause of Oriental reunion in Spain.

Fr. Morillo is also editor-in-chief of the review published by this organization entitled *Oriente.* This review supplanted another review of the same name and began existence as a scholarly quarterly review at the beginning of the year 1951, when a new popular monthly review for the unionistic apostolate was founded with the title *Oriente Cristiano.* The address of both publications is Conde de Cartagena, 17 (Colonia del Retiro,) Madrid, Spain.

* * * *

PORTUGAL

Byzantine-Slav Liturgy at Fatima Celebration

A solemn concelebration in Byzantine-Slav rite was performed at the Fatima shrine as part of the festivities held there in October. The celebrant was Bishop Paul Meletyev, a convert from the dissident Russian Church; concelebrants were Fr. Gustav Wetter, S.J., rector of the Russicum College

at Rome, and the spiritual director of that College, Rev. Anthony Koren. Clerics of the Russicum executed the music. Members of the Russicum had come to Fatima at the invitation of Bishop Jose Alves Correia da Silva of Leiria. This concelebration was a poignant reminder of the prayers for conversion of Russia urged by Our Lady at the time of her apparition at Fatima. (NC)

* * * *

SCANDINAVIA

Progress of Church in Scandinavia

According to the statistical table released by the St. Ansgar's Scandinavian Catholic League at New York, the greatest progress of the Church in Scandinavia is being made in Denmark.

The Church in Denmark counts 22,000 faithful in a population of 3,614,000. In Sweden there are 18,500 Catholics in a population of 6,986,180; in Norway, 4,890 Catholics in a population of 2,846,000; in Finland 1,870 Catholics in a population of 4,052,177 and in Iceland 500 Catholics in a population of 127,770.

There are 99 priests serving in Denmark; 39 in Sweden, 48 in Norway; 14 in Finland, and 10 in Iceland. The Church has 23 native priests in Denmark; 6 in Sweden; 8 in Norway; 1 in Finland, and 2 in Iceland.

There are 812 nuns in Denmark, 144 in Sweden, 419 in Norway, 20 in Finland, and 29 in Iceland. There are 30 Catholic schools in Denmark with 1,425 pupils; 6 in Sweden with 300 pupils; 20 in Norway with 386 pupils; 1 in Finland with 280 pupils, and 2 in Iceland with 259 pupils. There are 4 Catholic publications in Denmark including a weekly paper; 3 in Norway with a weekly; 2 in Sweden, and 1 in Finland. (NC)

* * * *

AUSTRALIA

Russian Catholic Priest

In December Rev. Andrew Katkoff, M.I.C., a priest of Byzantine rite, left England for Australia. He will be the first Russian Catholic Priest to exercise his ministry in that country. He will act as an itinerant chaplain under the Federal Catholic Immigration Committee. Fr. Katkoff has spent many years as a missionary in China. (NC)

* * * *

POLAND

Catholic University Continues

Five Bishops headed by the Primate Archbishop Stefan Wyszynski, took part in the opening of the school year at the Catholic University of Lublin. It is the only private college existing in Poland, and the only Catholic University behind the Iron Curtain. The state tolerates it, and recognizes its diplomas, but gives no subsidies to it. It is maintained by the Society of Friends of the Catholic University of Lublin. The student body numbers more than 2,000 and the faculty is made up of 26 professors, 24 assistant professors, and 17 instructors. Rev. Josef Iwanicki is rector. Although the University's activities are restricted by the communist regime, the Polish

Episcopate continues to direct it. It is to be noted that the Catholic University is never mentioned in official reports. (NC)

* * * *

U. S. S. R.

Visit of Dr. Niemoller to Moscow

With regard to the much discussed visit of Dr. Niemoller at Moscow in January we find the following statement in the Ecumenical Press Service (Feb. 8, 1952:)

The executive Committee of the World Council of Churches meeting at Lambeth Palace under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Chichester issued the following statement:

"Upon the request of the Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches, Dr. Martin Niemoller gave a report on his recent visit to Moscow. He emphasized that he had gone to Moscow on his own responsibility and on the invitation of the Patriarchate of Moscow in order to get a personal impression of the situation of the Churches in Russia and to meet the Patriarch. He had been deeply impressed by the signs of spiritual vitality in both the Orthodox and the Protestant Churches and by their sense of spiritual fellowship with Christians in other parts of the world. His discussions with Church leaders had given him an opportunity to explain the nature and purpose of the ecumenical movement.

"The Executive Committee expressed appreciation for Dr. Niemoller's report and for the fact that through his visit a further personal contact had been made with Christians in Russia."

Report of Former British Ambassador

According to Sir David Kelly, recently retired British Ambassador to Moscow, the Catholic Church has now completely ceased to function openly in Russia.

Although the French Church of St. Louis in Moscow, in the charge of the Assumptionist Fathers, under the protection of the French Embassy is reported to be still open, it is now controlled by the Communist regime which exercises control through an accommodating Lithuanian priest.

Fr. Arthur O. Brassard, A.A., an American, who was sent to serve the church of St. Louis, has never been permitted to function at the church. He has, however, celebrated Mass at the residence of the U.S. Ambassador and in other private homes. He is in Moscow under the terms of the Roosevelt-Litvinov agreement of 1934.

All Lutheran and Anglican churches have been closed, while Baptists and Seventh Day Adventists are left more or less free.

The dissident Oriental Church is free, but the priests are not allowed to exercise influence outside their churches, and religious education is not permitted in schools. In Moscow, which has a population of about 3,000,000, 40 dissident Oriental churches are open and always crowded. Many churches are still used as storehouses or barracks.

The Moslems and Jews both offer difficult problems to the present regime. The Jews are referred to as "homeless cosmopolitans" but are prevented from emigrating to Israel.

Fr. Thomas, former Apostolic Administrator of Russia, and parish priest

of Moscow, reports that in addition to the Church of St. Louis two other Catholic churches still remain open in Russia. One is in Leningrad under the care of a Latvian priest, and another in Odessa where the faithful meet on Sundays in spite of the absence of a priest. (NC)

* * * *

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Autocephalous Status of Dissident Oriental Church

In the Moscow Patriarchate journal, under date of December 1951, Patriarch Alexis publishes the following statement:

"The Russian Orthodox Church, in the person of the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, Alexis, and of the Holy Episcopal Sobor, is, at the request of the Sobor of the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia, bestowing upon this Church hitherto an exarchate of the Moscow Patriarchate, the status of autocephaly."

We are informed by the NCWC news correspondent at Linz, Austria, that the nature of this independence should be interpreted in the light of the fact that a native Russian, Metropolitan Jeleferij, has been made head of this autocephalous church, even though the current constitution contains a prohibition of foreigners holding church offices. After the Catholic bishops and priests of oriental rite had been eliminated, the dissident Church sent priests, most of them reportedly from Russia, to administer the parishes. The new autocephalous church also extends its authority over the large group of Greek "Orthodox" in Czechoslovakia.

* * * *

ORIENTAL CHURCH

Statistics According to Ritual Languages

Donald Attwater, author on works concerning the Oriental Church, has published statistics in an article entitled *Language in Use* (*Amen,* quarterly of The Vernacular Society) showing the use of spoken languages in various Oriental rites. We cite the following:

Churches having for all practical purposes their liturgical services in the spoken tongue:

CHURCH	RITE	LANGUAGE	NUMBERS
Melkite (Syria, Palestine, Egypt)	Byzantine	Arabic	350,000
Rumanian	Byzantine	Rumanian	1,500,000
Hungarian-Ruthenian	Byzantine	Magyar	160,000
Malankarese (India)	West Syrian	Malayalam	65,000
		Total	2,075,000

Churches having some admixture of the spoken tongue:

CHURCH	RITE	LANGUAGE	NUMBERS
Coptic (Egypt)	Coptic	Coptic and Arabic	65,000
Syrian	West Syrian	Syriac and Arabic	75,000
Maronite (Lebanon)	Maronite	Syriac and Arabic	500,000
Chaldean (Iraq)	Chaldean	Syriac and Arabic	100,000
		Total	740,000

Churches having unused forms of living languages:

CHURCH	RITE	LANGUAGE	NUMBERS
Ukrainian	Byzantine	Church Slavonic	4,900,000
Carpatho-Ruthenian	Byzantine	Church Slavonic	950,000
Yugoslav	Byzantine	Church Slavonic	60,000
Russian and Byelorussian groups	Byzantine	Church Slavonic	22,000
Bulgarian	Byzantine	Church Slavonic	5,500
Greek	Byzantine	Church Greek	3,500
Georgian (USSR)	Byzantine	Old Georgian Classical	?
Armenian	Armenian	Armenian	150,000
		Total	6,091,000

Churches having dead languages:

CHURCH	RITE	LANGUAGE	NUMBERS
Abyssinian	Ethiopic	Ge'ez	40,000
Malabarese (India)	Malabarese	Syriac	928,000
Italo-Greek-Albanian	Byzantine	Church Greek	65,000
		Total	1,033,000

* * * *

GREECE

Center of Studies at Athens

The Augustinians of the Assumption have established a Center of Byzantine Studies at Athens, in rue Eptanison. This center is a section of the Institute of Byzantine studies which was recently founded at Paris by the Assumptionist Fathers.

The Center has a story behind it. Pope Leo XIII encouraged a foundation of a Center of Studies by the Assumptionist Fathers at Constantinople in 1895, or more precisely at Kadikoy, the ancient Chalcedonia. A library was built up which was frequented by many scholars, as well as the young dissident ecclesiastics of the Patriarchal Theological School of Halki.

In 1922 the exchange of populations withdrew the greater part of the Christians of Asia Minor and Thrace, and diminished the Christian population of Constantinople. The Center and the Library were then transferred to Bucarest where they were greatly appreciated by both Catholic and dissident scholars. The Assumptionists continued their work during the war. After their expulsion under the Communist regime, the Library was finally brought to Paris through the energetic intervention of the French Government.

The Center at Athens has opened with a modest library, and the expectation of increasing until it becomes a thriving center of Eastern Christian studies. (SICO)

* * * *

LEBANON

Consecration of Melkite Bishop

Msgr. Athanasius Chaeir, former vicar general of the Melkite Archdiocese of Beirut was consecrated Bishop of Paneas (ancient Caesarea Philippi) at Beirut in November by Patriarch Maximos IV Saigh of Antioch of the Melkites. (NC)

JORDAN

New Greek Catholic Church

A new Greek Catholic Church dedicated to the Sacred Heart was blessed by His Beatitude Maximus IV Saigh, Patriarch of Antioch of the Melkites at Zarka, near Amman, last November. A dissident priest and many dissident laymen were among the large congregation filling the church on this occasion. In his sermon the Patriarch reminded the congregation that the new church was a gift of American Catholics through the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, for whom he asked constant prayers. (NC)

* * * *

ISRAEL

Statistics on Christians

According to a booklet *Christians in Israel: A Survey* edited by Dr. Ch. Wardi for the Government of Israel Ministry of Religious Affairs, Jerusalem, October, 1950, the Christians in Israel in 1949 were as follows:

Catholics:	
Latins	4,113
Maronites	96
Syrians	11
Greek-Melkites	11,544
Total Catholics	16,630
Other Christians:	
Dissident Orientals	11,764
Protestants	985
Unspecified	2,936
Total Christian population	32,315

Another Israeli Government publication, *The Arabs in Israel,* gives the total number of Christians as 34,000 of which 20,000 are Catholics. According to an article entitled *The Christian Church in Israel* by M.Y. Gen-Gavriel published in the Jerusalem publication *Horizon,* the total Christian population would be 51,000. The observation is made that "a relatively large number of the Catholics are monks and nuns."

Some of the difference between the totals is accounted for by a statement in *Christians in Israel*: "Although no official estimate is available, this total (of 32,315 Christians) is believed to have increased during the last 18 months by some 15,000, partly through natural increase and partly owing to immigration of European Christians, repatriation of Palestinian Arabs, infiltration of refugees from Lebanon and the Kingdom of Jordan, and release of POWs who chose to stay in Israel." However, it would seem that as a matter of fact the greater proportion of the increase is due to immigrant Christians of Jewish blood. A conservative estimate of converts from Judaism (mostly converted in Europe) would place their number at 12,000.

Comparing the statistics with 1946 one finds that in these five eventful

years two-thirds of the Christians have virtually disappeared in the region that is now known as Israel.

* * * *

ETHIOPIA

Dissident Copts Consecrate Bishops

For the first time the dissident Coptic Church in Ethiopia consecrated its own bishops last November. Five new prelates were consecrated by Amba Basilios, first native born primate of Ethiopia. Formerly Ethiopian bishops were consecrated in Egypt by the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria, titular head of all dissident Coptic Churches in Africa and the Near East.

* * * *

EGYPT

New Superior for Vast Franciscan Mission

Rev. Pancratius Ceccherini, O.F.M., has been appointed Superior of the Franciscan Mission of Upper Egypt, one of the most ancient and important Franciscan Missions in the Near East.

Fr. Pancratius has mastered the Arabic language and has the faculty to celebrate in both Latin and Coptic rites. His jurisdiction extends from Cairo to Asswan, a territory with a population of 7,685,000 of whom 7,000,000 are Moslems, 600,000 dissident Copts, 50,000 Protestants, and only 35,000 Catholics, mostly of Coptic rite under the Catholic Coptic-rite Bishops of Minya, Assiut, and Tahta. The mission conducts 21 parishes in the villages, with a total parish population of 7,884, served by 36 Franciscan priests belonging to Coptic and Latin Rites. They are assisted by 140 Sisters of 5 religious congregations in operating 140 schools with a total enrollment of 6,740, and with 84 dispensaries. The mission receives assistance from the Catholic Near East Welfare Association. St. Francis himself was the first Franciscan missionary in Egypt. The mission actually dates from a station at Akhmin, Upper Egypt, founded in 1666. (NC)

Book Reviews

Eugenio Zolli, *Il Salterio* (A new translation of the Psalter with commentary;) A.V.E., Milano 1951.

There is no need of pointing out to those who know the Biblical field that Professor Zolli has a most intimate and very profound understanding of the Old Testament. That holy text is the center about which all his studies have revolved from the time of his infancy. As he tells us in the preface of his new Psalter, he has had the Book of Psalms in his hands for the last 63 years. With this translation he gives us the benefit of his vast and mature preparation.

The very name of Professor Zolli is in itself a recommendation and a guarantee. He is endowed with innate sensitivity for the finest nuances of the Hebrew language. When he speaks of it, he speaks with the particular authority of one who speaks of his mother tongue. What other scholars derive from painstaking labor, Professor Zolli perceives quite naturally, or rather senses instinctively.

This Psalter is then the fruit of his unique and exquisite sensitivity. The text flows along smoothly, couched in nicely chosen Italian language. It was the intention of the author to give us almost exclusively a translation. True, a commentary would allow for an infinity of clarifications, but he has wished to restrict it to a modicum, and this of a philological sort, as he explains in his preface (p. 6.)

Professor Zolli, as we know, is a faithful defender of the Masoretic text, and departs from it only when he must look elsewhere for interpretation. Even so, he frequently beats new paths, and his original interpretations are perhaps the most valuable feature of both translation and commentary, however little they may be appreciated by those who are not specialists. To the students of Hebrew philology, however, he opens up noteworthy fields of discussion. Professor Zolli, as we have said, enjoys a unique familiarity with Hebrew and its kindred languages; they are in his blood. Oftentimes, and without any hesitation he will associate Hebrew roots—even some very well known ones of the Old Testament—with roots of kindred language (Syriac, Arabic, Aramaic,) and arrive at meanings that differ from the commonly accepted sense of the Hebrew. His principle is without doubt well founded and justifiable. In our days no one claims that the Hebrew language can be enclosed between the covers of Genesius' dictionary. In this he is corroborated by the modern philological current of a now famous American school which studies the Hebrew language in the light of new discoveries, and with its findings contributes to the enrichening of that language.

Yet some of Professor Zolli's practical applications can be puzzling. For instance, in Psalm IV, 5, he has recourse to Arabic and Syriac, and introduces the concept of *submissive song* (*canto sommesso*) on the beds. Is this an entirely happy solution, and does it fit the context? To do this, the translater must separate verses 5 and 6 from the rest, and make of them an element which interrupts the chain of thought.

We would also point out that he has, here and there, accepted emendations of modern scholars which do not seem altogether persuasive as he does in the case of the famous *de torrente in via bibet propterea exaltabit caput* of Psalm 110, verse 7 (emendation depending upon a different division of

words.) He would have the *way* soaked with *fat*. We have the concept of earth being soaked with *blood* in other places, and even conceding that parallel passages could be found to corroborate his interpretation, it is easy to substantiate the reading that the LXX made of this passage in the Masoretic text. Moreover, it makes perfectly good sense. We suspend judgment before such an emendation.

As is to be inferred from these comments, Professor Zolli advances many personal opinions in both translation and notes which, in the proper place, should prove to be of great value in arousing fruitful discussion.

This new study of an ancient text is most welcome. Since the divine Word of God is infinitely rich, where is the scholar who can pretend to exhaust it once and for all? Lovers of the Sacred Scriptures, and especially those who love the Book of Psalms—that Old Testament garden where the most beautiful flowers of theology and spirituality grow—will be deeply grateful to Professor Zolli for his highly successful labors, for the new light he has thrown upon the Psalms, and the occasion he has given us for a fresh enjoyment of them. PIETRO BOCACCIO, S.J.

La Priere de Jesus: Sa Genese et son developpement dans la Tradition religieuse Byzantino-slave (The Prayer of Jesus: Its origins and development in the Byzantine-slave religious Tradition.) By a monk of the Oriental Church; published by Chevetogne, 1951, 107 p. in 12°;40 Belg. Frs.

This small book is a compilation of articles that were published in the *Irenikon* of 1947; it deals with the invocation of the name of Jesus in the Oriental school of spirituality. The author begins by giving the biblical foundations for this devotion. He analyzes the texts of the Old Testament on the sanctification of God's name, and cites the more important texts relative to the name of Jesus which are found in the New Testament. He continues with an account of the devotion to the name of Jesus as it was found among the Fathers of the Church. He says that "the Fathers who have influenced the development of piety regarding the name of Jesus were not dogmaticians. They stayed more or less outside the great speculative currents and concentrated upon the questions of the interior life" (p. 18.)

Monastic tradition prepared the way for the *Prayer of Jesus* by evolving the short ejaculatory form of prayer (p. 21.) Hesychasm associated the ejaculatory prayer with the name of Jesus, and then the *Prayer of Jesus* came into being.

The founder of this type of spirituality was St. Diadokos of Photike, an ascetic and mystic. In his hundred chapters on spiritual perfection written about 458, he highly recommends purification of the heart and the continual remembrance of Jesus. One should without cease cry "Lord Jesus!" (p. 25.)

In two clear and understanding chapters, the author traces the historical development of the *Prayer of Jesus* in the Sinaitical period. Its characteristic notes are tenderness and lyricism centering about the person and name of Jesus. Then follows the Athonic period characterized by regulated psychophysiological technique and rigidity of method.

In the fourth chapter he tells how this form of piety was propagated during the 18th century. The mention of the *Philokalia* in the last of Hesy-

chastic writings affords the author an occasion to make an apology for the *Prayer of Jesus*. Here he distinguishes the formula from the methods. The formula constitutes the essence of the *Prayer of Jesus*. This is the formula: "Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have pity on me, a sinner" (p. 65.) He observes, "Nevertheless, one must recall that the name of Jesus alone suffices to constitute the prayer of Jesus" (p. 68.) The author undertakes to show us that "there exists, underlying this very simple formula of the *Prayer of Jesus*, a whole and very rich theology" and that "far from being monotonous, this prayer offers wonderful diversity" (p. 68.)

Prescinding from the essence of the *Prayer of Jesus* in the invocation of Jesus' name, there are also corporal methods of "psycho-physiological procedures" (p. 73,) and "psycho-physiological techniques" (p. 80, 72) which, according to Theophane Govorov (1815-1894,) celebrated Russian ascetic, a devotee of this mode of prayer, and the re-editor of the *Dobrotolubie*, "scandalizes some and discourages them from its practice, while it deforms the very exercize of it among others" (p. 80.) These procedures are nothing but "exterior preparations for interior activity that contribute nothing essential" (p. 80.) The psycho-physiological techniques are to be highly recommended in certain circumstance, but for the faithful in general they could be useless and dangerous. In particular cases, however, and under the direction of enlightened directors, they could be beneficial (p. 72.) It follows that when considering the historical development of this prayer, one should make a distinction between the permissible forms of this technique, and those harmful usages that are to be discouraged.

After making this distinction between formula and method, the apology terminates with responses to some Latin theologians who have advanced very unfavorable opinions on the *Prayer of Jesus*, and have shown undue lack of respect to the Hesychasts (p. 73.) The author complains of "attacks that are often unjust and crude" (p. 54,) and points out that it is too easy for Latin writers to make ironic remarks and to be shocked by the Hesychast technique (p. 71.) He justly requests respectful reserve, not only for the formula, but for the Hesychast technique as well (p. 72.)

In the fifth and final chapter, when treating of the *Tales of the Pilgrim*, the author speaks of the diffusion of the *Prayer of Jesus* in the twentieth century, especially among the Russian emigrés. He points out that the *Tales of the Pilgrim*, so characteristic of Orthodox Russia, has been received with extraordinary favor by many Romans, Anglicans, Lutherans, and Calvinists (p. 91.) Moreover, he assures us, the *Prayer of Jesus* is our common patrimony; it dates back to the greatest antiquity and is more than a private devotion because it is "at a certain point . . . the canonical prayer of the Church" (p. 69-71.) If properly understood and wisely propagated "it could benefit the cause of Christian unity because the invocation of the name of Jesus was, in its origins, common to all; it remains acceptable to all, and accessible to all" (p. 97.)

A. Liuima, S.J.